

aging, and we have had conferences relating to the various facets of school health education. Now we need to dig deeper than all of those and, instead of health education going it alone, we ought to arrange for a multidisciplinary study involving all areas that deal with human health in order to produce a picture of the depth and breadth of human needs and the available solutions to them.

We in health education have no monopoly on such effort. Neither does biology or home economics or physiology or nursing. We need a massive multimillion dollar 10-year study to identify the knowledge now available and useful, not only to us in health education but to all teachers who purport to deal with human health problems. If we want persons to be free, we have to give them the tools with which to create such freedom.

If humans are to be free, they must be emancipated from their present bondage of primitive materialism in order to release their powers of creativity and appreciation. There is absolutely no reason to believe that we know all there is to know about human perceptive or receptive powers. Researchers are continuously revealing new knowledge about the brain and the nervous system. Who is to say that new forms of consciousness will not appear, new relationships within the human's holistic nature will not force us to recast our whole present conception of physical, mental, and emotional?

This process of expanding our concept of the human is wholly within the boundaries of that provocative definition of education that says it is the process by which one comes into possession of oneself and one's powers through continuous participation in the achievements of the race. Where else in all of education will such an opportunity be better presented to achieve this expansion of one's awareness than in our three fields of health education, physical education, and recreation?

Would it be too far-fetched to say that our society is, or at least ought to be, concerned about the relation of humanity to the biomass of which it is a part in the ratio of about 1 to 10,000? Victor Shaller suggests, in the October 1973 *Smithsonian*, this killing, whether it is of people in political wars or electric chairs, or of animals in the wild, can be erosive to the human spirit. The conservationists are telling us that the violence we bring to life is counter-productive to our species. It becomes difficult to speak of the conservation of human life in isolation from the conservation of all living things, and therefore, the health educator is implored to cast his or her view of conservation in the light of both outer and inner nature—for wild animals and for humanity. There is, after all, only a slim line of differentiation between the survival requirements of humans and those of other forms of living things. The lesson is clear: if humanity is to survive free, it had better see to it that it lives in some sort of ecological harmony with its environment.

It ought to be clear to us all that no one yet has charted, nor will anyone ever chart, the boundaries of any of our three fields. We are not now and will never be finite. Each of them involves experience as one seeks to develop, survive, and expand one's ego within one's environment. Thus, when we face the curious bit of educational administration by which we are required to construct a curriculum for health instruction, we face a task that, by its very nature, has to be repeated every year. Why? Because one's experience, needs, and interests never remain static. They are always expanding into new realms. One of the principal compulsions of the educational process is to lead into ever-deepening and widening social and scientific spheres. Curriculum limits can be determined only by the intellectual maturity of the students involved.

Just how extensive do you see these fields of health education and physical education? Limited to the contents of any good high school textbook? Circumscribed by the circulatory glow following a good "workout"? We have, so far, created many scenarios, each devoted to an exploration of some aspect of human behavior as it relates to and helps us form a concept of human nature. The exercise physiologists come up with a fragment of knowledge regarding interval training. The dietician tells us something about vitamin C and the common cold. Useful information, but it must never be forgotten that as we seek wisdom and understanding of the human being, the realities of the human state cannot be exhausted by any of its single projections. Any particular human phenomenon always reflects a state of being. A study can be fruitful only if there is an awareness of the whole to which the fragments can be related. There is no particular harm in either discovering or learning about these fragments of knowledge concerning the human being (there very well may be something in cigarette smoke that predisposes to emphysema), but unless one has a vision of wholeness, unless one is predisposed to understanding wholeness, it will not be possible to use the full import of the value of fragmented knowledge.

Basic, then, to any study of the contribution of our various sciences would be the development of an intellectual vision of the whole. There should be no confusion between an understanding of the whole person versus a conception of the whole but fragmented person. Under these conditions, all of the fragmented and ostensibly unrelated contributions of physics and chemistry, microbiology and physiology, and all the others could be woven into a huge tapestry descriptive of the nature of the human and useful to us as the ultimate reference for instruction in health education.

Health education, broadly defined, includes more than the instructional aspects of a program. I care not that there are some whose vision is so provincial that they try to limit their concept of health education only to those things that go on in a classroom with the usual appurtenances of teaching. That is far too narrow to make good sense. The broader view stems from the simple concept

that whatever happens to us is educating, and if we plan good things as a part of a school program to include immunization programs, physical examinations, hearing tests, and vision screening, then those things are educational as well as medical in their impact and thus become a part of a broadly defined program of health education. It follows that what we call school health services and the development of a healthful school environment become, with the instructional program, a tripartite program of school health education. No matter that a variety of professional personnel is needed. That does not alter the fact that when a child is immunized for smallpox, it is an educational experience as well as a medical one. By the time you add up all the things that happen to a child in school that may or do have a bearing upon the child's health, you have a broad program of health education. Any more limited and restricted concept is so unrealistic as to be absurd.

One of the promising, relatively new aspects of all this is the gratifying rise of interest in the medicine of learning. We are watching the expansion of medical interest in organized education, from the supervision of vision testing and immunization programs and other such relatively simple processes to an approach to a thorough study of medical problems involved in learning. What can medicine offer in the instance of the slow learner? Is the lazy child anemic? Is the underachiever not merely not motivated, but is there a functional disorder present that may be nutritional or endocrinological in origin? Is there a dyslexia or functional word-blankness behind a reading disability? What are the neurologic involvements in reading disability? Are we interested in discovering any asthenia, autism, or hormonal deficiencies? Do energy-absorbing factors, parent rejection, insomnia, delayed sexual development, or sibling rivalry put a damper on learning?

This sort of exploration has a significant bearing upon the program of prevention, correction, and development that we arrange under the aegis of health education. It is good to see. Let us hope that as people give thought and attention to the broad and general development of education as a whole, they remember that the quality of learning depends upon the quality of the tissue doing the learning.

How can one be free if one has no basis in knowledge for an ability to separate the real from the fraudulent or to pick to pieces the massive flood of advertising with which we are drenched every day? I shudder to think of the millions of our people who are not free but held within the shackles of ignorance as they struggle with their problems of anxiety, genetic handicaps, allergies, nutritional deficiencies, marital discord, infirmities, suicidal tendencies, depressions, and others and who, because they have not cultivated an understanding of these things in their school health education, become victims of the multimillion-dollar program of quackery rampant in our society.

Those were some of the things that I thought about as I tried to figure out what the Anneman from Des Moines was trying to tell me. To live in a free society, we have to learn certain personal and social skills, accept certain responsibilities, do certain things and refrain from doing certain others. I am convinced that our three fields are potentially in the center of this endeavor. We can become, if we are not already, central forces in the development of the science of human experience. Let's get with it, because "you teachers are the most important people in the world!"

Physical Education in Higher Education

As colleges and universities examine their places in the structure of American life, they emphasize their dual role of meeting the continuous need for broadening the individual while preparing the individual professionally for useful service. To meet the first responsibility requires a complex of curricular and noncurricular endeavors, participation within which is likely to enrich the scope, broaden the outlook, and produce the "liberally educated person." Human needs for growth are not terminal, answerable once and for all by "a course." They are continuous, varied, and involve the unified nature of the organism. Thus, some of the experiences within a university are designed to impart knowledge, some emphasize its use and interpretation, but others deal more with the student's own life. Physical education serves this last function. Admittedly, it does not operate in every respect as other "courses." But, true to its heritage in early Greek tradition, its aim is to enrich the understanding of students of themselves, to provide them with the means for a thoughtful "administration" of their own lives, to aid them in the development of the ability to accept themselves. It operates in a medium of personal development.

This makes it none the less "academic." There is nothing in any definition of the term that would categorize such efforts as are thoughtfully expended by a modern program of physical education as "nonacademic." Only if efforts in

Prepared for a discussion by the Academic Council of the Ohio State University of the relation of physical education to general education, November 1960.

the "classical, history, and mathematical pursuit" ignore the student completely and eliminate entirely the human equation in their teaching would physical education disclaim relationship to the best in the academic world.

But its laboratories—the play fields, gymnasia, and pools—are not laboratories where bridges are planned or formulas tested. Nor do we seek in them new strains of bacteria or new spectral phenomena. They are laboratories where changes in human personality take place, where human resources are cultivated.

The availability of the department—its staff, facilities, and program—and its predictable atmosphere attracts students. They mingle. They learn from each other. If Henry Steele Commager, the historian, is correct when he says that much of education takes place in the association of students, then the program is significant in offering this kind of opportunity.

What is the quality and character of the experience in physical education? The experience is developmental, not remedial. There are some who believe that physical education at the college level is like remedial mathematics—good only for those who have not had it in high school or who need it only for some therapeutic type of physical development. This view is largely inaccurate. The developmental needs of college students are real and continuous. They are manifest in all students, not just a few. These needs do not disappear with age. To remove such a program from the schedules of the vast majority of college students would remove a part of experience clearly needed for best development.

As J. F. Williams has suggested, it must be appreciated that every human experience is a magnificent mixture. We may identify one element as more prominent than another, but we misunderstand the nature of experience whenever we regard any act as exclusively composed of the quality with which we attempt to endow it. Experience is an interaction of the whole organism with its environment, and the environment includes other persons as well as tradition, customs, and the local physical surroundings. Indeed, so clear is this fact that medicine, jurisprudence, and education have rewritten their practices in order to take into account the total situation—the individual reacting to and interacting with all the forces of the environment that play upon the materials of the human being. Because every experience embodies the reaction and interaction of the individual to and with the environment, the experience cannot be purely physical or purely mental. Only the need for identification breaks experience into such categories as spiritual, mental, social, moral, intellectual, or physical. These are terms of convenience and largely without reality. Although common sense recognizes that one factor may be dominant, *it is never wholly exclusive.*

We shall keep the balance even, if we remember that the physical experience is physical in its outward manifestation but mental and emotional, social and moral, in its relationships and meanings. One may not like the physical, but it remains, permanent and abiding, going on from generation to generation.

The movement experience itself has emphases of its own that are not inconsequential. It aids with the identification of self in a way that cannot be duplicated. It is a form of nonverbal communication reflecting a nonverbal intelligence that is expressive, creative, and continuously serving as a medium for learning.

From such a viewpoint it is apparent that both the cult of muscle and the singular search for intellectual development as the only valid outcome of education leave much to be desired. Each viewpoint neglects the implications of unity. The modern spirit in physical education seeks the education of the human being through physical activities as one aspect of the social effort for human enlightenment.

This recasting of the scene for physical education is no superficial move, but a tendency toward deeper growth. It holds that we need to aim higher than health, than victorious teams, than strong muscles, than profuse perspiration. It sees physical education primarily as a way of living and seeks to conduct its activities so as to set a standard that will surpass the average and the commonplace. There is in such a view something of the loftier virtues of courage, endurance, and strength; the natural attributes of play, imagination, joyousness, and pride; and through it all, the spirit of splendid living—honest, worthy, and competent—so much desired by each individual.

Physical education, however, stands not alone in the dilemma of special disciplines. All of education has been, and still is, confronted with the problem. The old scholastic and Puritan doctrines that separated mind from body, that held the body as essentially evil, have emphasized the contrast today between an education for life and an education for death. Education for life, or modern education, and education through the physical, or modern physical education, have mutual supports and confidences. Education for life can hardly be conceived without generous allowance for this kind of physical education, but physical education pointed at its own culture, at its own minor objectives, becomes not an education for life at all. The identity, then, of education for life (modern education) and education through the physical (modern physical education) requires understanding by educators of the aim, scope, and objectives of modern physical education and by physical educators of the objects and concerns of modern education. Education through the physical will be judged even as education for life will be judged—by the contribution it makes to fine

living. It should therefore be declared that physical education seeks to further the purposes of modern education when it stands for the finest kind of living.

From the proceedings of the Twelfth National Conference on Higher Education (1957) have come many significant statements relative to the character and purpose of general education. From Professor Mayhew, formerly of Michigan State University, we quote this rather explicit description:

General Education seeks to achieve a number of educational values, such as the development of abilities to read, write, speak, listen, think, be an effective citizen, use leisure wisely, be an effective family member, and regulate one's life with regard for the principle of sound mental and physical health. These goals, or very similar ones, have come to be accepted by students and by most faculty members throughout the country. They are also coming to be accepted by various important lay and professional groups which exercise some measure of influence over undergraduate curricula.

The experience a student receives in physical education or health education very clearly contributes to a number of these values in a rather substantial way. To use leisure wisely, to be an effective family member, and to "regulate one's life with regard for the principle of sound mental and physical health" are directly within the vortex of departmental purposes and program.

In 1954 when Frederic Heimberger, vice-president for instruction and research, the Ohio State University, Columbus, wrote his belief that "our baccalaureate degree should attest to the fact that its recipient has successfully completed a course of study designed with care to develop individuals of considerable breadth of understanding, and having reasonable command of certain basic skills," did he have in mind the experience one gets in physical education? Dr. Heimberger hopes the course of study will "nurture the student's awareness of his possibilities for his continuing growth as a person . . . and aid in the fullest possible development of the student as an intelligent, discriminating, effective individual." From experience in physical education come unmistakable signs of such growth, of a maturity derived from participation in both health education and physical education.

Cardinal Newman would describe the liberally educated person as one who "has common ground with every class . . . who is a pleasant companion . . . whose mind has resources for happiness at home when it cannot be abroad." From experience in physical education can come such understanding and such talent.

The 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education advises that stu-

students should be helped to attain a "satisfactory emotional and social adjustment" to their world. Within games and sports the well-educated player can manifest such adjustment.

Within virtually every description of a liberally educated person or of general education, the physical education experience contains a potential contribution. The field of sport, the experience in play, the world of movement are roundly developmental and personally educative. They contain not only ingredients of their own but have the added advantage of being able to provide an opportunity for students to practice what they have learned elsewhere. Experience in the practical and realistic laboratory in human relations, which a gymnasium is, affords insights into race relations, the nature of democratic action, ethical behavior, and other social and biological phenomena.

Dance adds another dimension to physical education not hitherto mentioned. As an art form it contributes to the cultural and creative development of students, essential ingredients in a balanced basic education. Dance as art possesses its own authority and its own enlightenment. It is intellectually as well as physically developmental. It is emotionally enriching. The force in art that has to do with beliefs, dedication, and spiritual energy, that leads to sharpened values by which people come to know themselves and others, surely has an important place in a university.

The case is clear, sure, and unmistakable that physical education is one facet of the general education of the student.

There are some who insist that curricular elements make unique contributions. In composition one learns to write; in arithmetic, to figure. But surely no one believes those skills are all one learns from those sources, or that no other sources contribute to those skills. So it is with physical education. The human organism being what it is, and experience being such a magnificent mixture, it is impossible to claim uniqueness for physical education.

If there is an emphasis indigenous to the program, it is in the development of fitness. Some would call it "physical" fitness—a derivative sometimes of muscle development. Humans being active creatures, possessed of great vital systems upon which their welfare depends, use muscular development not merely for strength at work but because muscular development is interdependent with all other systems. Without strength the organism fails.

There need be no apology for exercise. It may be unpopular with some. It may represent values held in low esteem by those who believe the "body" to be crass and the "mind" exalted. But all such regard for physical activity denies the intellectual integrity of those who hold the value low. They betray how little

they know of the facts, the true nature of humans. Those who would cultivate the intellect alone as a goal of education are victims of their own spurious intellectualism and need to be brought up rather sharply against the facts of life.

Fitness is that state that characterizes the degree to which a person is able to function. It implies the ability of each person to live most effectively within his or her potentialities. Ability to function depends upon the many components of fitness, all of which are related to each other and all mutually dependent. Human development takes place only in that way. Leave one component out and the total organism suffers.

If the physical education experience has something to do with muscular activity, either currently or in terms of future use, then its relation to fitness is clear. Without exercise, without educated attention to all the components of fitness, no educational program can fairly be judged either realistic or maximally productive.

Thirty-seven million people were boating on the fresh or salt waterways of the nation last summer. There were 8 million golfers, 7 million tennis players, 60 million fishermen and hunters. There is a practical relation between this kind of leisure activity and college physical education. The latter should and does provide the skills and understandings that make participation pleasurable. University physical education does not embrace as its prime responsibility the pleasant team games of adolescence. It moves beyond those into the realm of adult activity and makes an effort to supply the college student with opportunity for experience in attractive and active leisure pursuits.

It is a learning-teaching situation and the instructional effort is done with care and thoroughness. The leisure needs of American men and women offer a clear challenge to colleges and to the physical education departments within those colleges. The needs should be met. Instruction in these areas place the physical education of students clearly within the orbit of their "general education."

We Learn from the Culture of People

Modern physical education can give strength to the social and political culture of the day. In what do we believe? In equality among persons?

Applied to physical education, what does the concept of equality of opportunity mean? It means that all students are entitled to a physical education program geared to their interests and abilities. Girls should have opportunities equal to boys, and the atypical should have opportunities suited to their needs and abilities. A physical education class or an athletic event is, in a small way, a laboratory where interracial, interreligious, intersexual, interregional, intergroup problems of any kind can be worked out. The solution is not always apparent, nor is it always easy—but it is always discoverable, and the opportunity is always present to make the ideal a reality.

An intelligently developed physical education program will be a model for a sophisticated and enlightened society that holds all persons worthy of admiration. All persons therefore will be given opportunities to prove themselves and to seek their own potential. Help will be given to both the disadvantaged and the advantaged so that both may have the satisfaction of achieving their potential. Equality of opportunity does not mean equality of opportunity to achieve mediocrity. It means the opportunity to reach one's highest excellence. The

Adapted from an address to teachers in Emporia, Kansas, March 30, 1951.

development of athletic stars is one of the obligations of a good physical education program. An "athletic aristocracy" is evil only if there is no just way to become a member. As long as the group is "open" and can be entered by virtue of accomplishment, there is little to worry about. The physical educator will honor the star, but will refuse to allow him or her to monopolize the time, money, equipment, and space of the physical education program.

It is a common practice to use athletics as the "whipping boy" of modern education. There are many that complain about an overemphasis upon athletics. What exactly do they mean? Perhaps they feel that a school gives too much "time away from studies" for athletics. Or that athletics are a nuisance with their unscheduled pep rallies, their strutting drum majors, their card tricks. Or they are repelled by the arrogance of a few big athletes who act as if they own the school. Maybe they are complaining that the athletic program "gets everything," and there is nothing left for the other aspects of education.

One point of view holds that as long as the competitive athletic program follows socially acceptable lines, makes no extraordinary demands upon the school calendar, and is a wholesome influence upon its participants, it is not "overemphasized" and should be raised to higher levels. Perhaps no program of physical education, including athletics, can be overemphasized until every boy and girl in the school has the opportunity to learn and to be satisfyingly successful in a sport or other recreational activity of his or her choice. There is surely a tendency toward underemphasis. To apply the concept to equality of opportunity fully, the right of the highly skilled to his or her fullest development must be preserved against those who would deny it.

Equality of opportunity requires that differing aspects of the program be of equal worth. It is a popular weakness to hold excellence in some sports of greater value than excellence in others. If a girl is a good horsewoman, is she held in higher or lower esteem than her classmate who is a good basketball player? If a boy is a football player and a good one, is he thus "better" than the golfer or the tennis player who is actually as good in his sport? What are the implications behind the spurious and undemocratic distinctions between major and minor sports? What gives an activity status? That an activity does not draw a big "gate" is of no consequence to its educational value, nor is it any reason that the opportunity for status gain should not be equal. *The thing that makes a sport major or minor is the contribution that sport makes to the one who plays it.* Football is a major sport to a football player, but not to a tennis player; fencing is a major sport to a fencer. Any other consideration to determine importance is unsound educationally and is either (a) a reflection of the domination of commercial or financial considerations or (b) an interesting form of snobbery in which those who play before the biggest crowds award themselves the biggest letters and have the biggest banquets. In school sports all

letters should be equal in size, all recognition of letter winners the same, and talent, wherever found, encouraged and developed to the fullest. There should be equality of opportunity to excel with status in anything that one attempts to do.

Equality of opportunity means having the same chance in the use of facilities and equipment. Physical education and recreation programs are benefiting from the 20th century reinterpretation of "public wealth." In the earlier days of the republic it was difficult for many to see that human rights transcended importance property or material rights. We had, and have, a capital devoted to the preservation of individual enterprise. In the 19th century deviation allowed great forest tracts to be bought for cutting, huge shore to be used for railroads, and all areas in a city to be built on. Long hours of labor were required to earn a living. Slowly the nation has revalued human rights. Now national and state parks are preserved for the people's pleasure. Large apartment communities with playground facilities for children are built where tenements and factories were before. Shorter working days and shorter working weeks provide more leisure in which to pursue the good things in life. We are looking more and more at "public wealth" as including entertainment, joy, a good home, and good recreational facilities.

This concept has evolved because the typical American has believed that if something is good that is available only to a few it should be retained to use if it could not be made available to the masses. Take golf for instance. Golf was imported as a rich man's game. One had to have fancy knickerbockers, golf pants and money for club membership, only the elite played. That did not last long. Golf was a good thing. People liked it. It thus became the property of the public, and now municipal golf courses are scattered all over the country and everyone can play the game. Golf has become a victim of democracy! There is now equal opportunity for all to play.

The current recreation movement is the result of the application of this facet of democracy. Public swimming pools, parks, clubhouses, playgrounds, fishing preserves, winter parks, campsites, organized dramatic groups, choruses, basketball teams, bowling leagues, and hundreds of other enterprises are significant evidence that the democratic American wants everyone to share the good things. Physical education personnel may do two things in the classroom, help provide the good things and teach people how to use them and use them well.

The concept of equality of opportunity has been mainly responsible for the problems now confronting us with regard to unemployment. Americans, in its original English sense, were a hardy determination. The answer was a greater wage. The gentleman was a hardworker. He did not have to work because he had

money. He turned to sports for fun, distraction, and probably relief from boredom.

Americans reject the idea of activities designed exclusively for a select few and hold the professional player and the "gentleman" player in equal esteem, judging each on his talent—if a man is good enough, he is good enough. Thus, it is difficult to persuade young Americans that there is something evil about receiving money for playing games—earning money for almost everything else is highly regarded. The people of the world are slowly beginning to acknowledge that game performance should be the only criterion and, here and there, are giving amateurs and professionals equal opportunities to compete for and win championships. Tennis has made a strong move in this direction. Golf is acknowledging both the professional and amateur.

The question of amateurism is further complicated by the different international interpretations of the word. Contesting countries in the Olympic games, for example, have widely varying standards of amateurism. To many, where the money comes from to pay the athlete makes not a shred of difference. If the money to enable training is advanced by the government that is no different than if it is advanced by public subscription. Perhaps we will some day approach the idea that a country should send to the Olympics its best athletes and forget that they should be "amateurs." Such a policy would go a long way toward providing equality of opportunity for the participation of the best and would make honest the assertions and the principles to which the Olympic champions subscribe.

Our culture places a high premium upon excellence. We disavow mediocrity. We want everyone to have a chance, but we applaud the one who stands out as the best. We cheer the great teams because they represent the superlative development of the individual and the coordinated teamwork of a group. Both have made this country famous. A modern physical education program provides both, for the dabbler and the expert, the ordinary person and the All-American, and neither may claim more than his or her share of what the state has provided.

Through the Looking Glass

We look through the looking glass to see where we are, and what we see is not always a happy vision. We have great strengths and we should emphasize them. We also have great vulnerabilities and we should change to remove them. Let us look at some of the vulnerable spots.

In recent years we have scattered our forces. One wonders now whether we represent a solid front with a single purpose. We used to be the American Physical Education Association; then we became the Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. Now we are the American Alliance. There is talk of split-offs from that. One wonders, now, who we are. Are we people representing health education, physical education, recreation, safety education, driver training education, athletics, fitness programs, physical training, cheerleading, drill teams, something ROTC is a substitute for, or just what? We are not like the Modern Language Association or the American Physical Society or the American Psychiatric Association or the American Association of Music Teachers—who seem to have a cluster of related goals having to do with the basic education in their particular area of interest. But when we get shot at by our critics, there does not seem to be a single body to rise up and answer those critics forcefully in terms of what we represent in the education of children. We need to consolidate our forces and speak out firmly

Delivered at the annual meeting of the New York State Health, Physical Education and Recreation Association, Buffalo, January 21, 1960

and automatically about what we are and what we believe and what the contribution is that we make to American education.

Another vulnerable spot lies in the fact that our boundaries of recognized professional status are shaky. It seems that almost anybody can claim to be a physical education teacher -- maybe he has a law degree and a glib tongue, maybe she wears a purple cape or is a television star writing frequently in slick magazines. We have people who pay homage to the body flexible and who prance around the stage in silver leotards. There are quacks all over the place; there are fakers promoting their curious notions and making hay out of the body beautiful. We have dozens of exercise boys advocating everything from stick drills and ballet courtse exercises to the water cure.

Many of us are confused. We confuse ends with means. There are those who believe that physical exercise is the end -- the desideratum of physical education -- that exercise is an end in itself and not a means. There are those who are unimpressed by the championship of the Rose Bowl or just a plain victory is in itself the end -- the most desirable thing there is. Weight training to many becomes merely the end of their experience in physical education. And there are those who speak the gibberish of sport for sport's sake, which of course is utterly ridiculous.

A decade or so ago, we tested some 10 million children in schools and came up with the remarkable conclusion that a large and dangerous percentage of our children were "unfit." When anybody asked the question, "unfit for what?" we were dubbed subversive in our attitude toward the goals of our national association. That whole testing program showed some interesting things. Of course it showed that there were some people who were not muscicularly prepared to do what is expected of them. Of course it showed up some immediate weaknesses in the status, both medical and psychological, of many children. Of course it showed the appetite of some is intensely the vigor of the physical activity program in schools. One would, however, wonder whether the results were worth the price we paid. We wonder whether that vast and important testing program created in some the loss to continue a lifetime of activity -- whether it was revealing, attractive, enjoyable. We produced sweat by the bucketful. But how interesting that at about the same time that testing program was going on, went the requirement of physical education and health education in probably 50 major universities and colleges in this country? Wasn't it interesting that at about that time, we underwent a reappraisal of our place in the educational world and very little of what we lost has been regained? One wonders if we were not buying at the moment of fitness to satisfy a popular notion at the time. Those who really control education -- people who have membership in the Educational Policies Commission or other important educational groups -- gave us merely a passing and perhaps whirling glance.

Even though we claim to be educational, we have abused the basic tenet of educational practice—namely, repetition. We teach volleyball year after year, basketball and softball year after year, swimming to those who already can swim, touch football to those who already can play touch football. In school after school an examination of any given class or year will show that the activities performed in the physical education class are the same activities the children performed last year. And yet, in some places, we complain of a crowded curriculum! At what point does the law of diminishing returns operate? At what point do we ignore and do violence to good educational principle and practice?

We have witnessed, and in many places we have protested, the utter degradation of sport. We have seen behavior at basketball games among participants and spectators reach a new low level. We have seen hardminded violence and admired it in many places. We have tolerated the misbehaving tennis player or the cheating golfer. We have, in many places, allowed to go without protest sharp practice and dirty play to the point where the practice of sport on its finest ethical plane is a rarity and the arts of peaceful existence on the playfield are not always seen. And yet one of our great strengths, which we see through a properly conducted sport program, is the development of the best of humanity, in which sport becomes a pleasant interlude, enriching our understanding of each other, in which we test our skill against the other person in an atmosphere of pleasant rivalry, and where we give, above all, a manifestation of clear-cut and reasonable democracy in action through the administration of the principle of equality of opportunity.

The prototype of sport at its best may not be found perhaps, in the organized effort within the school. We have seen it in the leisure activity of the hunter or the camper or the skier, the outdoorsman, the fisherman, the one who walks the beach or takes a pleasant climb up the mountain. Somehow, when we bring these things into an organized setting, we seem to stray from the idea that the important part of participation is that of value—personal and group—which comes from the kind of interaction these activities provide.

We need to give more encouragement to innovation, to creativity, and to sport participation without fear of disgrace from defeat or the disquieting overvaluation of the victor. We need to strengthen all the premium placed upon individuality and upon the social ethic through the sport situation.

There is also an excellent opportunity, if we would but pursue it, in bringing a stronger type of intellectualism to the program. Our strengths must be found in our history. It should never be forgotten that the process we call physical education is old phylogenetically. It has been here for 10,000 years, and it will be here for 10,000 more. It is an ancient source of human group activity as

well as individual enterprise. It has become now what it was then, a part of the learning process in which the organism became receptive to learning the modes of behavior that were transmitted through participation in the sports, games, and dances of the ages. This process we cannot destroy. We can only enhance it. Once we see that we have a life to educate and the means with which to do it, if we would quit trying to make something out of our games that they are not or trying to advance them for our own motive of glory and just try to maintain through our own wit, intelligence, and skill the orderly process of teaching the great lessons of a liberal education through our activities, perhaps we could obtain what President Hixler of Colby College was talking about when he said that the purposes of a liberal education are to help people understand the difference between the good and beautiful and the cheap and shoddy. There is definition enough for us. Can there not be some thread of understanding running through experience in physical education that goes beyond sweat and victory into the deep understanding of human problems? I think so.

Our problem is to bring to the countless thousands of our students the quiet satisfactions of achievement, of acceptance, of confidence—to bring to the average, the dub, the girl or boy who may not be outstanding, the quiet confidence of the knowledge that she or he is capable of hitting a golf ball or dancing or bowling or camping or canoeing or handling a sail.

In the evolution and, perhaps, revolution in American education, we cannot stand alone, nor can we stand knee deep in confusion. We have so much to give, so much talent with which to give it. We must not allow our basic programs of recreation or of health education or of physical education to go to waste.

And so through the looking glass we see so many stereotyped misconceptions of physical education that a highly motivated and competent teacher in the field will find an enticing and compelling opportunity to destroy these misconceptions at every opportunity. Among them are the following:

1. That body development is an end in itself.
2. That the human heart is structurally unable to stand the rigors of extreme tasks.
3. That all athletes are dumb—or they wouldn't be athletes.
4. That the intellectual interest of physical education teachers is low.
5. That exercise itself is childish, and one ought to abandon it after adolescence.
6. That the trichotomy of body, mind, and spirit exists, and that body is low on the totum pole.
7. That exercise and physical education are the same thing.
8. That the physical makes no contribution to experience.
9. That winning is all—there is nothing else.
10. That "nice guys finish last."

211

11. That the physical educator knows little about constructive educational philosophy, curriculum practice, or administration. We will survive, of course, but we will continue to survive more comfortably if we will destroy those myths in popular opinion.

Concepts of Administration

In the evolution of social thought and practice there have appeared various types of administrative activity. Society is constantly trying to create a kind of administrative practice that will secure the ideals for which it strives. Over the centuries great social patterns have appeared—the socialist, the communist, the fascist, the dictatorial, the democratic. No social system can survive if its administration betrays it.

Leadership in a democracy, as elsewhere, means administrative power. And there are many who search for power through the administrative role—men and women who are tempted by and succumb to the lust for administrative control. Often these people have been rugged individualists and have given immense vitality to business—and to education. In the 18th and 19th centuries, there were great spirits in education who stood for what they believed or wanted and who by one means or another created an educational structure in which power was not the least of the emoluments.

In physical education this individualism assumed various forms—some amusing, some annoying. It produced the strutting martinet who called commands, made decisions, ordered things to be done, and administered programs of physical education constricted within the watertight compartments of his own doctrinaire mind. He seldom changed, he seldom listened, he never read.

Adapted from the textbook *Physical Education*, New York: Hager & Row, 1951

Students were his meat and he devoured them. He imposed his will because he knew best what was "good" for all people.

There was also the power-oriented administrator who wore an iron hand in a glove of velvet. This individual had been autocratically schooled and believed he or she had similar autocratic responsibility to the staff and students. He was possessive about *his* staff, *his* department, *his* students, *his* program; and he made sure that those who did not acknowledge the worth of his administration were sent to other fields for pasturing. He demanded loyalty whether he earned it or not and expected respect as an adjunct to *his* title.

In autocratic situations such as these, tension, individual hostility, and lack of stability in the group membership are frequent and characteristic outcomes. Fear is the auxiliary of these people no matter how well-meaning they believe their administrative policies to be.

Another type of physical education administrator became, in some instances, so all-powerful that he surpassed in influence even the superintendent of schools or the president of the university. Through the decades it has taken to produce the current huge program of interscholastic sport, there has emerged the modern educational counterpart of the 19th century timber baron—the athletic director who never teaches, never confers, never submits a problem to group decision, always decides himself, cares little for students, and spends long hours in the counting house planning budgets for the far-flung athletic empire he has built. Under such administrators, the educational aspects of sport and games become secondary to the financial gain and amassed publicity which assure status and prestige. Administration becomes a method by which self-aggrandizement is attained. It is singularly unfortunate for the general field of physical education that in some schools and colleges the program has been placed under the leadership of such a person. Girls' programs, particularly, are known to suffer neglect because of the unsympathetic attitude of the "hard man" who knows or cares little about the overall objectives of physical education.

At the same time, there has emerged a brand of ineffectual, inefficient administration in education and in physical education. People with power have simply not known how to use it. Programs have been allowed to rot, to fall to pieces, to disintegrate. Or they have grown only so far and no further. Here one finds the physical education program made up of a limited number of activities. Although the school possesses facilities for more, no additions are ever made because of some small administrative obstacle that seems insurmountable at the time. One sees programs of vigorous physical education without towels for bathing; without lines on the fields; with makeshift bases on the diamonds; with sloppy, lazy, and unambitious teachers; and with locker rooms that would profit

from the use of a broom. Such matters are administrative. They are marks of an inefficiency or ineptness that jeopardizes the value of the physical education program to the educational system and the student.

Of course, hundreds of high schools and colleges have effective, useful, and skillfully handled programs. There are administrators who have set up administrative practices in accord with the needs of the students, the relative ease with which these needs can be met, and the determination to make of physical education a force for democratic living. These administrators are thoughtful, erudite, sensitive men and women.

The good administrator sees himself as a sort of executive servant, one who carries out the will, meets the needs, executes the desires of the group. He is responsive to group action, participates in the formulation of group opinion, seeks and distributes information on the problems at hand, guides group thinking into orderly channels, but in the end he administers the program in terms of the expressed wisdom of the group. He is not afraid to make decisions when they are his to make, but he does not "pull rank" when he has delegated decision making. Such an administrator conceives of his job as that of making others comfortable, of facilitating teaching, of enhancing the richness of the program. True democratic administration seeks to serve, not dominate; guide, not order; and act, not defer.

The personal standards of the physical education teacher and administrator are of unusual importance. Although every teacher in the school is expected to exemplify the best in character and personal integrity, there are circumstances in the physical education and athletic setting that give added emphasis to this necessity. In the first place, there are times when the physical education teacher-administrator, like the band conductor and the director of the glee club, is on public display--parents and the general public are likely to know him and be aware of his private as well as his working behavior. This visibility gives the coach a special sort of status. What he does, what he says, even the clothes he wears are noticed and frequently imitated. There has always been a certain amount of hero worship associated with leadership in sport, and both the man and the woman in physical education may as well accept this circumstance and turn it to the advantage of the students.

Because of the special fascination the athletics and sports phase of physical education programs have for a large segment of the public, the physical education teacher-administrator generally meets a good many more people than do other members of the school staff--the fans; the team followers; the personnel of press, radio, and television; anxious parents; people from competing schools; representatives from professional sport; and, in some instances, gamblers and other curious characters who hang onto the fringe of sport. The

Teacher-administrator must learn what can be safely said, how to say it, and in public; how to conduct himself in public life so that the students and the program gain rather than lose from these contacts.

Also, this public interest engenders the so-called "pressures" under which coaches work. The more intense the pressures, the more difficult it is to maintain one's stability and purpose. The temptations to side with vested interests, to play favorites, to grant special privilege, to resent criticism, to lose one's temper are all very real, and difficult situations abound. This aspect of the program certainly demands stability and integrity of its administrators.

Another reason for the premium on personal integrity in physical education is that the budget for the program is usually relatively high. Money is spent for equipment, money is charged for games and exhibitions, funds representing certain special aspects of the program must be administered. Interscholastic activities are used in flexible ways. The administrator has to learn early in life how to handle money, keep accounts, purchase equipment, and in general deal fairly and with scrupulous honesty in all such matters. There is often the temptation to become allied with outside interests. This may involve anything from a substantial discount from the local sports store because the equipment is purchased there to being approached for the endorsement of specific commercial products with all of the attendant national publicity. These fiscal responsibilities make integrity of the highest quality an absolute must for the physical educator.

Physical educators must make a very special effort to interrelate with others in the educational system. It is unfortunate when physical education teachers gain the reputation of being somewhat exclusive and unwilling to assume their share of educational responsibility or when the rest of the faculty believes the physical education teacher capable of dealing only with fitness and recreation and not with the intellectual aspects of school life. These attitudes seem to develop when the after-school activities keep the teachers away from faculty meetings or committee work. Physical education teachers, therefore, have a special obligation to attend faculty meetings as a matter of course (even though in occasional practice must go on under student leadership). They should make themselves available for committee work and should, in every way, represent the best in democratic participation and action within the school. Much of the criticism leveled at physical education, including athletics, comes from persons who are either uninformed or jealous of the prominence of the program. The presence of the teachers at meetings attended by other staff members gives a chance for discussion. Teachers of physical education must constantly remember they are teachers first and physical educators second. That is to say, the welfare of the total school program must constantly come before the welfare of any one area.

In relation to administrative officials, such as the principal, superintendent, deans, and board members, one should make every effort to cultivate a friendly informality developed within the traditional "table of organization." The principal is in charge of the total program; the superintendent, of the system; the dean, of the college; the president, of the university. These people carry large umbrellas of responsibility, and the physical education teacher-administrator must work closely with them and be mindful of their relationship. Problems of curriculum, public relations, and personnel should be related to the proper officials, and no physical educator should at any time assume the prerogative of administrative decision or policy making unless such right has been specifically designated as his.

There are some administrators who genuinely enjoy the prominence of their position and react to it with modesty, humility, and good sense. Others deliberately create a reputation as showmen. They conduct themselves as prima donnas, expect fanfare and trumpets when they appear, act the fool on the bench with their protests and grimaces, and generally manifest a pitifully moronic type of exhibitionism. A physical education administrator can analyze his own reactions in this regard and must early decide whether he wishes to become a professional educator in the field of human development or a vaudeville clown with little concern for values other than "the gate," the score, and his own reputation.

For the teacher-administrator who would choose the professional way, the responsibility for continued education is imperative. Physical education is a dynamic field. New ideas are constantly coming to the fore; productive research, experimentation with new ideas, different organizational plans, new methods, different equipment are revealed constantly. Investigations into child development, the role of creative activity, the effect of play on mental health, and the meaning of movement are all worth following. Professional meetings provide an exchange of ideas. Professional literature reports recent advances in all aspects of the program. Correlative areas such as the social sciences, anthropology, and physiology are constantly throwing light on problems associated with physical education. No administrator of physical education can afford, either morally or intellectually, to slacken his interest in the scholarly aspects of the discipline. He must keep up with the literature, attend meetings, and generally be alert and informed about the totality that is education and the specific "cutting edge" of physical education.

Some Contributions of Physical Education to an Educated Life

All living things use movement as an instrument of expression and impression. The amoeba under the glass will react to varying stimuli by moving around. The collic will express his joy at the return of his master by convulsive waggings and affectionate leaps. The runabout child learns that table legs are hard by toddling full tilt into one. Of the unpredictable number of sensory stimuli received by any living organism, a good share are made possible because that organism has the capacity to move about, to alter his environment by moving, and thus to create new and different worlds for himself that teach him important lessons. Likewise ideas conjured up within find their efferent expression in movements as diverse as the flicker of an eye or the mad stampede of a frightened mob. Ideas, feelings, emotions, drives, or moods frequently can find their most satisfactory expression only through a movement of parts coordinated so as to bring satisfaction as a return for its doing.

Mankind always has used this capacity for coordinated movement to serve his purposes. The savage ran to capture or escape, the primitive tribesman swung a club to beat off an attacker, the Indian danced to invoke the favor of the gods, and the early Greeks wrestled for fun and for the beauty of body development. Later on the middle Europeans danced to the folk songs of their festivals, the Swedes invented exercises for therapeutic purposes, and the English played games and hunted because it was such good sport. But as

Published in The Journal of Health and Physical Education, January 1943

223

civilization has progressed it has made less and less urgent the need for movement as necessary to survival. Bullets take the place of clubs; carpenters build our houses for us; and the more these labor-saving substitutions develop, the more dancing, playing, swimming, and climbing we do just for the fun of it. We are neither inclined from choice nor predestined biologically to give up our capacity for muscular effort and retire to the armchair. If we do, we die.

What has happened in American education? Our schools and colleges were begun originally to train the mind. The early Puritanic philosophy held play as vulgar and schools would have none of it. The early pattern for American higher education was cut in the form of devotion to a dualistic intellectualism in which mind was an entity unrelated to the remainder of the organism. Actually the boys whose minds were trained at Harvard in the 17th century were not unlike the boys there now; so they played games, and when the lads at Princeton kicked an early American football through the chapel window they thus intruded the fact of their singleness of being into the sacred halls of this unsound intellectualism.

Shortly thereafter, in the 19th century, but unrelated to these impulses to play, physical training came into our schools. It had a Scandinavian and German ancestry. The English games were not a part of the beginnings of school physical training. German exercises and Swedish gymnastics prevailed. In community life, however, our pioneers hunted and fished and later they danced a little. They played games, either domestic or imported, and soon the school was doing one thing as physical training and people at large were doing others. The schools were at quite a loss to know what was the best for the children. The fatherlands all gave purpose to their physical training. Their exercise was for health, to discipline the youth of the land, or to celebrate an occasional festival. The American games seemed all for fun and amusement. Which of these purposes should the school adopt and develop its program to meet?

The 20th century has made the answer clear. We will have little of imported programs and purposes. We will choose some of the English rugby and develop American football, we will preserve and teach some old folk dances, we will run foot races as did the ancient Greeks; but we neglect soccer, are bored with calisthenics, use the Swedish horse to play on, and applaud but not perform the ballet. We are enthusiastic about tennis and golf (imported products), we invent baseball, and we ride and hunt and fish as all human beings do the world over. But we insist on our own purposes and our own development, and these are compatible with essential purposes of all education in this particular democracy. If American education aims at normal adjustment of the individual to his world then so does modern physical education in American schools. If the production of integrated personalities possessed of those qualities that make for

effective living within a democracy is the general purpose then the activities that educate through these motor avenues must contribute to these ends. A physical education is productive of more than organic or "physical" gains. These are important; but other outcomes can and must be sought if one is to appraise fairly the place of physical education in the American program of education.

To gain such a view of the part motor activities play in the education of a person one must begin, of course, with a broad view of education itself. It must be seen as education for living rather than just schooling. The boundaries of blackboards, recitations, and lectures must not define academic respectability. The broad view sees education as a series of living experiences, and if books, or trips, or chalk, or games, or a bonfire, or a bonfire, or a bonfire are necessary to enrich that life then those things are organized and arranged by skillful teachers as a part of the educational process. We are just beginning to understand what Dewey years ago pointed out—that it is the whole child we are educating, not just his memory centers. No picture of an educated life that has for its colors only the bright hues of poetry or the perspectives of mathematics will do. What a Hutchins or a Flexner may describe as their ideal of an educated life vanishes in the face of such rudimentary knowledge as science has given us about the relation of the psyche to the soma. Or as Williams has aptly put it,

This view sees life as a totality . . . and the modern spirit in physical education seeks the education of man through physical activities as one aspect of the effort for human enlightenment. . . . The 'cult of music' becomes as ludicrous as those who worship at the altar of mental development. Neither point of view suffices, neither is accurate.⁴

Culture must be judged in terms of totality of expression. There is nothing new about that. Plato argued it in his *Republic*, and John Locke urged the recognition of motor activities as a way of living. Herbert Spencer clamored for the development of a physical education for men and women, and contemporary thinkers such as Dewey, Bode, Horne, Jacks, and others all have pronounced the validity of motor experiences as contributors to education.

But it is necessary to particularize. Muscular strength is surely not the only outcome of a physical education. Just what kinds of learning accrue? There are, potentially, five—all of which may be classified by other names, perhaps, and surely all of which depend for their existence in large measure upon the quality of leadership that seeks them. From participation one learns, first, the skills and strategy of the activity at hand; second, the health implications of the activity; third, the behavior controls involved in the activity situations; fourth, the satisfactions from self-expression, through the activity as a means; and fifth, the history, contemporary status, and relationships of the activity. These

values, along with the health or organic values which we are not discussing here, are all potential. They may or may not accrue. Their fullest attainment depends upon good organization and expert teaching.

The first one can be disposed of quickly. It is obvious that one must learn how to *play* golf and that the strategy of tennis or football is not learned except through participation. The skills, the rules, and the plan for any game or dance are fundamental to the other values. Such learning is obviously as much of an "intellectual" exercise as it is a "physical" one. For our purposes let us assume an optimum mastery and move on to the other values.

From the activities, if properly taught, we can get an insight into health. Ringworm of the foot has spread because people are in ignorance of hygienic procedures following exercise. Success in athletics is dependent in some measure upon diet, sleep, and freedom from dissipation. Old lessons about healthful living spring normally and forcefully from such participation, and the refinements of the 20th century have not as yet developed an adequate substitute for a normal metabolism. If participation in activities calls up this kind of associate learning then the activities have added profitably to the sum of knowledge.

Third, the behavior controls involved in the activity may need some elaboration. Somewhere in the first year of life the behavior of the infant begins to take on social implications. His intra-uterine aloneness begins to disappear. He becomes related to others, first to his mother, then to family, then to playmates, and eventually he may develop a vision of the relation of himself to the world of people. This socializing process is not done without pain. The self-preservative drive is strong, and the competition or aggression manifested against other individuals is the result of it. In view of this, Arthur Timme holds it the duty of civilization in general and the school as its agent to modify this aggression into behavior useful in group life.² The hitting, shoving, and the biting of the child must be modified as he grows older.

Therein can be seen the effect of a physical education. "Play is training in socialization. By far the best and perhaps the only means of socializing the child," according to Timme.³ Play weans him from self-centeredness to material objects, to playthings, to playfellows, to the group, to the world of people. This process goes on all the time, with or without leadership, with or without the school. The important thing is to give direction to it, plan its outcomes, and the school and its teachers are responsible for such direction-giving and behavior-planning. Note that we have not said this responsibility was solely that of the physical education teacher. No such position is tenable. The physical education teacher and program are in the vortex of such a socializing process but the influence of *all* teachers affects these changes.

Furthermore, these modifying changes go on continuously through life, and play always is an instrument. We may grow too old to participate so we watch; and the spectator, through the well known process of identification, expresses behaviors of a social nature and has modifications made of his conduct. He will live through the players he watches.

Kimball Young adds further evidence to this. He says,

Recognition of the fact that the self arises from building up roles and the status that others require of us should convince us that a full life is possible only when we recognize the anticipation or claims of others upon us. This is exactly what socialization . . . means.¹

Thus the activities of physical education may become a remarkable instrument for socialization. In games and in sports we learn to expect things of our friends and we know our friends are expecting things of us. We take on status; we become persons. We rise and fall as we try to meet these expectations. We learn to judge and to be judged, and when a friend fails to measure up, lets us down in a tight foursome, or fumbles at a crucial moment, we, because others have expected things of us, are more tolerant of him. We recognize his weakness and his despair because we share them. We do, that is, if we have played, if our physical education has been a full one. It is usually the person whose physical education has been neglected who is intolerant enough to shout his abuse when players make mistakes.

The full life is possible only when we accurately gauge our role, and know where we stand with reference to our friends. We play hide-and-go-seek, dodgeball, tennis, or squash-racquets, and if we disappoint others we can either correct our mistake, withdraw from the game, or have our errors forgiven. We insist on one of the three happening. Life is uncomfortable until one does. We will go to lengths to make one of these happen. The alibi has its origin in these circumstances. Where the act has failed, we attempt to verbalize away its consequences. We try to explain. We always want to be right, to be well thought of, and we do not always succeed. The recognition of the claims others have on us, or of the role others expect us to play becomes strikingly apparent through the materials with which organized physical education deals.

The technique of socialization then begins to appear. The teacher must make clear what is expected; he must instruct us in the use of the tools that will meet this expectancy, and when failure attends our efforts, he must provide opportunity suitable to our capacity for establishing a satisfying equilibrium with our fellows.

Young makes it even more explicit when he says that "social and emotional

maturity is achieved only if the sense of freedom has a corresponding sense of responsibility." "In games or in a folk dance, the participant has freedom *and* responsibility. He cannot evade either. It was he who was caught off the bag, or fumbled his mashie shot, or missed his block, or who forgot to "act and turn single." When one enters an activity of this sort he has freedom, and if it takes responsibility to produce maturity then he has that also. His *own* actions become important to the team, the set, or even to the ~~whole game~~. The player of footballs can find few abilities to help him evade his ~~own~~ responsibility, and the teacher must see that he ~~must~~ *does* have the true ones. These games are stern *and* yet rich in opportunity for achieving maturity. They ~~respect~~ discipline and develop the weakling, they ~~present~~ *offer* growth opportunity for the "stronger," and they provide a yardstick for the ~~one~~ who is uncertain where he stands. Likewise they present a temptation for the ~~one~~ *so* called who is expert at defeat and splendid and useful stimuli for the ~~one~~ *truly* maturing personality.

It is within these spheres that good teaching is important. Bad teaching will be blind to this socializing process. It will permit egotism to take charge of some, cowardice and unhappiness born of consistent failure to spread in others, and complete lack of participation to be the lot of a few. Good teaching will, by paying attention to the individual differences, select and teach those activities holding most promise for socialization; it will be impatient with mass activities and prefer small groups where individual growth can be noticed; and it will help each individual undergo the socializing process to the end that he attains his full share of maturity.

In a republic where democratic personal relationships are expected to be the basis of the culture, it is not too much to expect that all of the areas within a curriculum will be capable of making a very real and demonstrable contribution to such democratic behavior in the individual. Can a contribution be made to such democratic living through physical education?

If the interplay of personality constantly found on the play field can be properly directed, the field, the court, the pool, the out-of-doors can be most significant as laboratories of the democratic process. Conversely men can be taught to hate each other, to hold others in disrespect, to take advantage, to "get the other guy," to nurse racial prejudices, to seek advantage, all through sport. In war, some of these latter qualities are necessary. American men cannot fight the enemy with kid gloves. Because we must win war we may have to forsake some of our notions of clean combat. Activities can be chosen and taught in physical education in such a way as to produce these fighting skills. But if the essence of the democratic way is to be measured by the quality of our respect for the other personality, then organized school and college physical education programs should be held strictly accountable for the kind and quality of teaching through their activities. Nothing may be tolerated that does not

guide the student into a deepened and widespread understanding of the democratic culture in which he lives.

Fourth, and irrevocably round, is the process of socializing process. Is the opportunity for normal personality development of orientation through and by the satisfactions arising out of self-expression. The play nature of physical education throws it into the center of the knowledge process. Physical education activities have a rich potential objectivity about them. Children play prisoner's base with all the realism they can muster. Sense of self in a handball game virtually disappears. Casting in a rushing stream gives small chance for any thoughts save those of the catch. All such activities, rightfully the material of a school-organized physical education can, so long as they are taught, produce an outward direction of consciousness judged as fully social and adjustment. The player becomes so absorbed in what he is doing that he has little or no time for himself and his worries. Through such activities, particularly when they are creative as in the dance, the objectivity of the activities makes some contribution to psychic integration. Richards is quoted as saying that play is our greatest ally in helping the personality that has become outgrowing to be outgrowing in its interest, desires, and responses."

Some of these results occur strikingly through the use of a physical education for the handicapped. Victims of infantile paralysis, tuberculosis of the bone, heart defects, and others too frequently judged to be unfit to receive a physical education are sometimes put on the shelf. These often disintegrate not only whatever muscular tissue and strength may be left, but also they develop those complexes and grievances characteristic of the handicapped. It appears possible to allay all this through an individualized physical education. The victim of paralysis who hates all things athletic, who is almost completely introverted and thus selfish and intolerant, is taught to swim. He struggles with other swimmers, he becomes a man among men, he finds a new way of living. He is well along toward a social rehabilitation he needed badly. The blind can be taught to dance, the deaf to play games, the nervous unable to catch and throw. The end results seem to be improved, in some instances, remade personalities. There are unexplored opportunities ahead in the field of physical education of the handicapped. We have only begun to experiment with it.

Less subtle of the values a well planned physical education will bring to the individual are the simple fun one gets from playing and dancing and the elemental satisfactions from having used one's limbs without having been bored. Fun, in itself, is valuable. Life need not all be serious business. We pay a heavy price for a laugh. We seem to welcome joy when it comes our way. Those things are obviously attainable through physical education activities.

The fifth type of learning, suggested as the history and contemporary status

and relationships of the activities, holds some promise in its contribution to an educated life. Bode is reported to have said, "Give me thirty children at the gates of the stadium and I will reveal the world to them." He referred, no doubt, to the contemporary relationships of the activities that went on in the stadium and the stadium itself. Of what design is the building? What were its antecedents? Why do people build and use stadiums? What values have games? What of the history of the world is reflected in the structure and the uses to which it is put? It behooves the teacher to explore, to miss no opportunity to further the process of integrating all knowledge and activity. The dance, alone, provides as rich an opportunity for concomitant learnings as any other aspect of a physical education. Dancing in any form requires music, employs design, may be itself a creative art, and in its interpretative aspects draws its ideas from life and expresses them through the artistry of its movements.

From a class in physical education or social science may come the need for knowing of the nature and extent of recreational facilities in a community. Some one, somewhere, may ask of the relationship between playgrounds and juvenile delinquency. An insight into the study of human behavior under stress may be an outgrowth of the relationships between physical education and psychology. There is material here, not all of it vital, not all of it interesting to all persons. The possibilities, however, have barely been touched.

The sum and substance of these potential contributions to an educated life point unmistakably to one thing. If the school harnesses these natural activities, uses them as a fundamental avenue of learning, calls the teaching of them "physical education," then it must recognize the importance of skilled leadership with sound scientific training. Wipe out every teacher and every program of physical education in schools today and the physical education of the race would still go on—albeit in a primitive fashion. The organized school is a product of civilization. It bends man's drives into social uses; it hopes to make the man himself integrated and complete. This hope makes necessary the teaching of physical education. But games alone will not do it. Just play without a plan, without thought, without direction, will make little contribution beyond the organic values to some of the more complicated problems of personality we face in today's school or college. Physical education teachers should know what they are doing. They should be students of the science of human development and educationists in the best sense of the word.

Thus physical education makes its contributions to the educated life. To attain them the program must be democratically administered and individually based; its games must be free from false values and unsound practices; its activities must have values that are most readily harvested by the participant. If we can develop that game, that contest, that activity in which the individual is used "not as a means merely but as an end" then the foundation upon which the superstructure of educational value may be raised will be safe.

For through a physical education we have the opportunity to help to bring man into possession of himself, to provide him with means for enjoying life, to give him friends and to accord him entire satisfaction of doing something well. The educated life surely renders these things valuable.

NOTES

1. J. E. Williams, "Education for Sound the Physical," *Journal of Higher Education*, May 1930, p. 279.
2. Arthur R. Tamm, "The Significance of Play and Recreation in Civilized Life," *Mental Hygiene* 18, no. 1, Jan. 1933, p. 31.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
4. Kenneth Young, "Freedom, Responsibility, and Self Control," *Mental Hygiene* 21, no. 4, April 1937, p. 477.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 478.
6. Margaret Powell, "Activity and the Mental Hygiene Program," *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 7, no. 9, Nov. 1933, p. 356.

What is the Meaning of the Noun Education?

Learning is the first and most lasting outcome of the physical education experience. Through movement, one develops understanding of oneself and one's world. One learns values and experiences beauty. One has fun. Physical education offers honesty and excellence to persons of widely differing abilities.

But to be truly educational, the physical education experience must provide opportunities for reflective thinking and allow for the intellectualizing of abstractions. This is one of the significant criteria by which the educational value in any phase of a physical education program can be judged.

There are some who believe that there is no thinking involved in movement. You just move -- it happens. They assume that students are taught, not to meet and solve problems, but to set into motion a series of reflexes that enable them, after wondrous acrobatic convolutions, to land on their feet rather than on their faces. Participation in a game is seen not as a series of strategies planned and difficulties solved, but as a group obeying the will of the coach who does all of the thinking while the students do the moving. Modern dance is seen as something for which the teacher chooses the music, does the choreography, determines the theme, prescribes the costumes and design, and "puts dancers through the paces."

Passage from an address delivered at the 30th anniversary celebration of the founding of the School of Physical Education at the University of Oregon, Seattle, Washington, April 3, 1970.

There are places, even today, where this picture of nonthinking is not overdrawn. Some teachers work out the "day's order" the night before, planning every minute of every hour. The resulting activities involve the individual very little in thinking—what thinking does occur done with attitudes toward the activity. Students can be found dashing from station to station as they circuit train at a teacher-determined cadence and whistle-punctuated intervals. We have scores of teachers, coaches, athletic or "physical" directors, who believe they can solve problems better than can the people they teach. This grand larceny, this theft of the right to think makes mockery of everything we know of education.

This unfortunate tradition of nonthinking in movement is *old* and deep-rooted. To assume that arriving at the sum of one plus one requires thought that counting ten push-ups cannot require is the height of absurdity. "Bodies" are supposed to be "trained." "Fitness" is supposed to be developed. The reflexes are supposed to take over when "activity" is learned. Such assumptions remind us of Dewey's caustic description: "The inert, stolid quality of current customs perverts learning into a willingness to follow where others point the way, into conformity, constriction, surrender of skepticism and experiment. . . . We think of the insolent coercions, the insinuating briberies, the pedagogic solemnities by which the freshness of youth can be faded and its vivid curiosities dulled. Education becomes the art of taking advantage of the helplessness of the young." ¹

Our discipline is called *physical education*, and the noun is as important as the adjective. The adjective—*physical*—describes the means. The noun—*education*—tells what happens. Physical education means that someone is educated; to be educated means to be able to think; to develop the ability to think we must give people the opportunity to think. This means that they will weigh values, make choices, solve problems, reason with consequences, plan a course of action, test hypotheses, arrive at conclusions, and come to decisions. Any other kind of "educational experience" is peripheral. To judge the educational value of any experience properly, one must evaluate the total experience—the performance itself, the events and lessons leading up to the performance, the choices made during the performance, and the conclusion derived from the performance which may be useful in future situations. When movement is viewed in such a context, it has meaning. Let us examine one aspect of physical education experience by way of illustration.

Disputes are inevitable in the context of a semester or season in physical education. Perhaps the game situation and the basic character of play bring them about. How are they settled? Obviously, there are various ways. They can be settled by fists or loud voices, by outtalking, outgelling, or outfighting—methods of passion, not of reason, that support might and require strength rather than sense.

One step above that level is to rely on rules. Rules are the crystallization of past experience. We have learned ways by which the activity goes best and have put them into rules. When an argument comes up, we consult the rules, we analyze our interpretation, and the dispute can be settled. This involves more sense than strength.

But there is still a higher level of adjusting matters. The parties involved, with time, patience, and some regard for each other's interests, should be willing to think through the disputed situation, see new elements in it, weigh the values involved, and come to a decision in terms of this particular, and perhaps novel, set of circumstances.

An interesting illustration of this possibility will be found in the story of a tournament basketball game in which the winner was awarded a one-point victory even though the referee had himself shot the one point! It came about this way: In the final quarter of a game in a tournament that meant quite a bit to the teams and the communities, a one-shot foul was called on A. When B stepped up to shoot the foul, the referee noticed the net was caught on the rim. Taking the ball, the referee flipped it through the basket, disengaging the net. The scorekeeper looked up just in time to see the ball coming down through the net and, thinking a point had been scored, marked it to the credit of B. Actually, the referee had shot the point and B had not. The mistake was not discovered until the final few minutes, and after the game A's team protested. The referee, however, signed the scorebook with the false score and did not ask the teams to resume play in an overtime period. From then on the situation became tense. A wanted B to play the game over, or at least the last quarter. B refused. Townspeople became involved; people took sides. The great question was, did B win or was the game a tie? The facts were clear that both teams had identical 34 points and the referee had scored one point, which had been credited to B.

Now suppose students had shared in the decision on the protest. Would not a situation of this sort be an excellent chance to allow students to do some real and vital thinking? Perhaps an assembly could be called at which time both sides of the issue could be aired. It could be pointed out in support of keeping the game that—

1. The scoreboard showing a point advantage in those last few minutes, a different strategy was used from the one that would have been in order if the score had been tied.
2. The game was over and the official said B had won. That is what officials are for and their decisions are final.
3. There would be no time to play the game over before the next tournament.
4. The Commissioner had sustained the fact that the game was legally over and that B was legally the winner.

On the other side it could be argued that:

1. B had not won. The score was really A-34, B-34. Referee-1.
2. To take the game was to take something that morally did not belong to B.
3. Despite all the rules and official judgments, the generous and courteous thing to do would have been to play some, if not all, of the game over.
4. No matter what decisions are made, no one will ever believe that B won the game.
5. How would B feel about it if the tables were turned?

If these and other arguments had been presented, the students could have held a referendum. After thorough discussion a vote could have been taken in which the players and the student body alike could have been asked to decide:

1. Shall the decision awarding the game to B stand?
2. Shall part of the game be played over?
3. Shall all of the game be played over?
4. Shall the game be ruled a tie?

It would have been interesting to see what the student reaction would have been (a) to the debate and discussion and (b) to the opportunity to vote on such a matter. Actually, such decisions are so rarely left to the students and are so frequently settled peremptorily by adults that one wonders how the chance for enhancing the educational content of athletics can be so completely missed. Surely, if we are going to teach, we must encourage decision making. The student must be given a chance to judge, to weigh, to evaluate, to test his own powers of thinking.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that thinking is the process through which meanings are developed and tested by firsthand experience in problem solving, one must not ignore still another opportunity to make a contribution to intellectual development through the physical education experience. Many movement patterns permit the individual to develop nonverbal abstractions and relationships involving time, space, force, design, and form. Such involvement calls for study, thought, and analysis. It calls for the discernment of relationships and the creation of meanings and represents an acceptable form of creative intelligence at work. It is obvious that dance makes use of such opportunities, but it is possible for this to occur in other activities as well. When people are encouraged to solve their own problems of movement, many exciting and wonderful things happen.

To solve problems; to reflect on past experiences; to reckon with consequences; to understand relationships; to act independently; to plan a course of action; to undertake a project; to synthesize, summarize, and conclude—these

things characterize learning and reflective thinking. It is the job of the physical education teacher to provide students liberally with opportunities to engage in these processes rather than do the thinking for them. This principle applies to all forms of teaching, from elementary school activity to intercollegiate athletics. The more the student is involved, the more educational the activity tends to be. Thinking is not just talking; it is not just reviewing last Saturday's film in a "skull session"—it is the involvement of the total individual in a process that makes demands of his or her ability to reason.

If, as a regular part of the physical education program, students are allowed to share the planning of the day-to-day experience; if discussion is held on better ways of doing things; if conduct is appraised for its consequences; if issues are made a part of class understanding; if the day's work is consecutive in relation to a larger project and does not insult the intelligence of students by asking them to change their direction every five minutes or by giving them drills that require a minimum of thought, then there is educational value in the program.

This principle poses a serious problem for modern athletic programs, particularly the games of baseball, basketball, and football. The coach flashes the signals, calls the pitch, tells the batter where to hit, directs the running of bases, sends in a play with every down, calls the defense strategy from the bench, sets up the playing combinations. If coaches did not do this, the game would surely be less than perfect. But we want nearly perfect play because we want victory, and for this we pay a heavy price—the player is denied the opportunity to learn many of the finer points of the game and, more important, is denied the right to make decisions, test his or her judgment, and thus *learn*. The more the adult control, the greater the depreciation of educational value. A wise plan to put coaches together in the stands during the game, and thus give the game back to the players, has been ignored. Yet, player control of the game has great merit and is surely worth a try.

One of the aims of education is to give learners such control over the methods of living in society that they will become increasingly independent of instruction. This means that teaching should be done so well that students can quickly learn to be self-directing and self-propelling. Students should be given a chance to think and act without constant suggestion, correction, planning, and directing from the teacher. One can no more overlook the necessity for cultivating skill in thinking through physical education than one would overlook the development of organic integrity. The whole person constantly confronts us.

Is it ethical for some to use the term *physical education* to describe what they do, when so many of them have only a vague idea of what the word *education* means and really could not care less? I believe that the term *physical education* has great and significant meaning. I thought that it was understood by all my

colleagues and coworkers and that our programs were evolving clearly in the directions American education was, and is, taking. But I was mistaken. We got just so far and then stopped and, in some places turned back. There remain today only a few thousand among us who, without an ounce of deception, can face the world as *educators* using the experiences from the motor world of gymnasium, pool, and camp as the *means* for educational development. All others have fallen back, either intimidated or enchanted by the draculian dichotomy of "physical" fitness. Or they find it comfortable not to *educate* in any dynamic and planned way but to seek comfort in the sleazy arms of that old mistress whose coat for those arms has embroidered across it that horrendous cliché about the sound body housing the sound mind. This is the babysitter's view of physical education.

All we have to do is provide a safe refuge for the mind--and it is the only thing that counts. So we exercise our kids. God, how we exercise them and drill them and wave their arms and bend their torsos and bark at them and test them! Back comes the gymnasium full of apparatus, back from oblivion comes physical training, back from limbo comes the drillmaster with his perspirometer to measure response to his silly commands.

We tried but we didn't quite make it—at least a lot of us didn't—and we still unethically call the resultant hodge-podge a program of physical *education*. They are not educators; they are conditioners. The "good workout" is their stock in trade and the performance and/or score of the ballgame their most popular evaluative devices. These people still call themselves physical educators. They are not. They are physical trainers, like dog trainers or horse trainers or exercise boys for horses, or they are professional entrepreneurs whose only concern is with the "gate," the championship, or the perfection of the skill.

Why this blast? Because insofar as my own human frailty will permit me, I detest unethical practice, and when a man or woman calls himself an *educator*, particularly a physical educator, then I insist he know what education is, what the goals of education are in this society, how the educational process works best, the relation of education to thinking, and in short, wherein lies learning. The noun *education* is more important than the adjective *physical*. The latter merely implies the means, the media, through which we educate.

This is an old argument in our field, and maybe we are at the stage now where we ought to resolve it. Maybe we ought to stand up and be counted. Maybe the time has come to separate into two camps—the educators and the trainers. I have nothing against physical conditioning. It is great for those who need it. It can be good therapy—even good development. Call it physical conditioning. Call it physical exercise. Call it anything you want. But don't call it physical education. There may not be room for both in American education. Let us

identify the differences by identifying the characteristics of *education* and then finding out what dance or the trampoline or camping or tennis or conditioning exercises have to do with it. And let us solve this major ethical problem by being honest in our declaration of purpose.

NOTE

1. John Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1922), p. 64.

202

A Test for Educational Value

One cannot be sure, always, of the educational value of any given physical education program. The organic or physical values may be clear enough. In fact many and varied values may be recognized. But how can we be sure of "educational" values?

A returning graduate student is asked how the year went. "Fine," he says. "Took my basketball team to the quarter finals in the district." There's a value. Games won and lost. Championships. Scores. Or he may report a successful year because of the addition of two new tennis courts or some new gear for the gymnasium. Another value. Facilities, equipment, space. And others may add a year to the requirement, or an hour to the weekly schedule, or a class in health to go along with the activities program—curriculum expansion, valuable of course, and a mark of progress. No curriculum such as that operated by well prepared physical education teachers can be judged properly by any single standard. All of the foregoing are significant in their relation to the aims of the program as a whole.

But what is physical education for? What are we trying to do in physical education? That is always a potent question—embarrassing to many who are either not sure of their ends or who, when their ends are stated, find them at variance with the goals of education. The scholar in physical education, in contrast to the meet-your-classroom-year-while-give-'em-a-workout teacher, is willing to ponder the question and to study his program in relation to criteria which have been derived from the purposes of American education.

Published in the Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Physical Educators, 1957

209

For it has been one of the most fortuitous accidents that physical education programs are found in schools and colleges. They might have been found only in community centers, YMCA's or athletic clubs, or in churches. Physical training was introduced originally in education as a body-building enterprise and as a means of discipline under the naive belief that young people needed "a sound mind in a sound body." But when a few began to see the necessity of cultivating the educational values in the program in order to remain in the educational structure it became a struggle against the "forces of reaction" who held to the old faculty psychology. Programs were to be judged by precision, sweat, and numbers and not by anything that smacks of the allegedly "softer" educational value.

And so it is with many today. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Tangible results must be shown! If you can't win games you are no good as a teacher. If the fitness scores do not rise sharper on the chart, then the program needs toughening up. If you don't have them march a little what kind of discipline can you get? And what we really need is a five-hour-a-week program every year so we can point with pride to the numbers we serve!

There *must* be clearer, more productive criteria—values that will stand the test of the 20th century, that have some bearing upon an *educated* life. Let us mention some of these and hold them up as value which, when found within a program, give assurance that *here* is education:

1. *A sense of respect for human personality.* Need this be described? It lies at the root of American life. It is one of our great beliefs. We basically hold human life in dignity and honor, and we must continue to do so if democracy is to survive. Where better to teach this than on the playfield? It is the glory of sport. To know, to honor, to enjoy the competitor and to hold him neither in contempt nor in indifference—these make the sport experience contributory to the furtherance of our way of life. It is the rankest of falsehood to teach that to be friendly with the opponent is to "soften" when the "heat is on." Pure rubbish. The best of friends can do battle on the field of play with no less heat than those who have been taught hate or contempt.

2. *A sense of morality.* Can we teach our children to do something for its inherent value alone—without thought of reward or recognition? Do we need a letter or a bet to be won or lost for every game? Do we need for every dance a picture in the paper or a write up in the college annual? There is reason to believe we can, but the drift is surely the other way—at least in competitive sport. Maybe that's why mountain climbers, fishermen, skiers and sailors look with pity upon the football star. They feel he may be deluded by glories unreal and know's not where the great values of sport are to be found. Does he? Is there anything about football that would deny him inherent satisfactions? Or is it only

in the way it is taught that football can become such a delusion and a fake? Physical education can be best taught when its students learn the quiet pleasures derived from doing something for values *inherent* in it. Thus they become discriminating and know the real from the false. Thus they cultivate a sense of morality.

3. *A sense of courtesy.* The cym. would say "Let's have none of this sweet courtesy. This is an age of bad manners, of retaliation, of loud talk and raucous laughter. Let's have none of the business of fair play." And yet this world of ours still holds a place for the gentleman and the gentlewoman. Courtesy, like chivalry, is not yet dead. There remains something fine about giving the opponent—the visitor—his choice of goals, or of inviting the visitors to a party after the game. A round of applause for the opponents' good play, an understanding that the competitor is human, too—those things can be taught, and when they are physical education is good. To teach children to be unselfish, less self-assertive, less abusive of others is an obligation and an opportunity in physical education.

4. *Reaching the student where he lives.* This is not too much to ask of physical education. Experiences within the program must touch the heart and soul of kids to make them a little better than they are. To give them a lift toward a better adjustment to an already tough life. To give them some inner pleasure and warmth and confidence. Pure sentiment? Perhaps, and a strange way to be judging the effectiveness of physical education! But the rag-tag who caught a smile from the "gym" teacher and lived for months on its nourishment is as important an "outcome" as the team that went to the quarter finals. And so is the amputee who came back in the swing of normal life because his physical education teacher gave him confidence and a good golf stroke. Why cannot the physical education teacher take 200 in a class and "exercise" them all at once? He can, but he cannot *educate* them under those conditions for the same reason no other teacher can. The outcomes are more personal in terms of individual growth, in terms of the child himself, and not found merely in his muscles.

5. *A sense of objectivity and extroversion.* What joy it is to talk with someone who is wholly unselfish, thoughtless of himself, modest, self-effacing and unassuming. Such virtues! Can they be taught? Is it possible to place the learning child in situations where his attention is on some ulterior purpose and not on himself alone? If an outcome of experience in physical education is an honest objectivity, a desirable outward turning of the consciousness, then we are making a real contribution to the normal adjustment of children. But from some of our activities, taught in typical ways, comes only self-consciousness and introspective worry and boasting. There he stands, like the Zulu warrior, for all the world to admire. Still flexing his muscles, doing giant swings, and telling about his prowess! Physical education should lead people gently by the hand out of themselves into the freer world of other affairs.

6. *A capacity for reflective thinking.* Here is an outcome more important than many of the others. In educational circles the premium is upon the intelligence. Take it or not, man still survives because he thinks. Schools and colleges devote themselves to the cultivation of the intellect. To the end that that means dualism—a belief in the separation of mind from body—it is spurious and iniquitous. But to the extent it challenges physical education to produce thinking people (and not just dumb athletes obediently following telephonic orders from coaches high on the roof of the stadium, or sweaty gymnasts whose principal intellectual effort is the decision as to when to use the chalk on his hands), it is a valid emphasis. Our games and dances must be so taught as to allow students a chance to think, to weigh values, to ponder consequences, to relate previous experiences, to seek solutions. To reflect. There is little such involved in matching tactics or the forward roll. And not much more in modern collegiate football. And by the absence or presence of opportunities for reflective thinking may a program be judged educational.

7. *An integrating relationship with the rest of the curriculum.* An elementary grade was studying England in their "core." The physical education teachers helped by teaching them English dances, providing material on English sports, discussing the English origins of our concept of amateurism, and explaining the Olympic games. All of which knit physical education more closely to the rest of the curriculum experience. Off by itself in the basement gymnasium, physical education has little opportunity to make such contributions. But in some schools it can.

8. *And skill.* With all the foregoing we must never forget the importance of skill. The know-how. The ability. A program can be judged in part by looking at the effort the teacher puts into the teaching of skill. The physical education period is no play period. It is not for intramurals. It is no place to loaf. It is a place to learn, to practice, to teach. Skill in performance, up to the level of enjoyment at least, is a basic element need, and no amount of glossing over by citation of some of the other values will cover a fundamental weakness if the students are not skilled. To teach them to do is to give the means, the instrument by which these other values may accrue.

Appraisal, evaluation may be done in those terms or in others. There are others easier to use. Credits, for example, or the percentage of participants in the intramural program. Those are all significant. When added up an estimate of the program may be had. If it is physical education we are teaching then evaluation must also be done in educational terms. And that means an appraisal of the effect of the physical education experience on the expanding personality of the developing student. What goal does it do him?

The Role of Physical Education in Health and Fitness

So far in the 20th century there have been four distinct periods of intensified interest in the role of physical education in fitness. We are today in the fourth discernible period. Theodore Roosevelt started the first one when he publicly advocated the vigorous life as a way of making our nation strong. The second was caused by the revelations of the physical examinations in World War I, which shocked legislators to the point where some 27 states passed laws in the succeeding ten years requiring that physical education be taught in schools as a way of improving the vigor of our youth. World War II brought the third national effort to improve physical fitness of the general as well as the school public. Those of us who were tapped for this sort of civilian service will remember that we were directed to rope off streets and by using available firemen and policemen lead the public in a program of exercises aimed at improving the fiber of the embattled American. And now for the fourth time in this century a wave of interest is felt. It is marked by Presidential citations of need and by extraordinary efforts from the Capitol to persuade communities to improve the fitness of youth by developing strong programs of health education and physical education including a recommended daily 15-minute period of vigorous exercises.

Delivered at a joint session of the American School Health Association and the Food and Nutrition, Maternal and Child Health, and School Health sections of the American Public Health Association at the 49th annual meeting, Detroit, November 14, 1961

Published in *American Journal of Public Health* 52: 1155-60, July 1962

20

Historically, such developments have occurred before. At various times when nations have faced perils, either real or imaginary, efforts have been made to improve the fitness of youth as an important part of the solution to the problem. Programs of physical training in 19th-century Germany and Sweden and in 20th-century Italy, Germany, and Russia have been used for national purposes in support of political or social ideologies. Youth has been captured in every instance and drilled, exercised, and strengthened to support the beneficent system and, more importantly, to protect that system against its enemies.

So it is with us. Undoubtedly, we need a strong populace for either a warm peace or the cold war. To guard the health of the nation is a worthy ambition no matter what our destiny may be. To control disease, to improve nutrition, to prevent mental and nervous diseases, to seek emotional, social, and intellectual stability, and to secure appropriate growth and development of children and youth become almost an abiding national passion. We are committed to such effort and enthusiastically so. Our form of political life not only requires a nation of healthy citizens, but guarantees them the right to be healthy.

But whenever we go through one of these periods of greater interest in fitness, we should at least be in possession of an accurate picture of need in order to develop a true program in response. We should be able to distinguish fact from fiction in both areas of need and program. How is it today?

Some people have developed a test of muscular strength and flexibility of the spine, given it to several thousand children here and abroad, find our youth comparing unfavorably with Europeans or Japanese or whoever, and have immediately concluded (a) that our children, in fact all of us, are weak and flabby, (b) that our technological culture is destructive of our capacity for survival, and (c) if we do nothing something about it we will lose the cold war. This position, widely advertised in the popular press, has created quite a national stir.

So once again programs of physical education are asked to step up the intensity of their purpose and the vigor of their content in order to save youth, and thus our country, from decrepitude, if not actual destruction! We have reemphasized an atrociously unscientific but popular term "physical fitness," and we are being told that our children are woefully deficient in it. It is alarming in more ways than one, because it is not a situation marked by clear fact, clear need, and clear response. In fact there is a great confusion in all three categories—of fact, of need, and of response or program.

For example, does one equate the sound advice and factual information of scientists in the area of child growth and development, or of pediatricians, with the television personality who advocates the efficient leg exercise for infants

three months old? Does one equate the scientific papers appearing in the collection from the Institute of Normal Human Anatomy meeting in Rome in 1960, and bearing the imprint of such international names as Larson, Hollmann, Simon, Wolffe, Jokl, Missuro, and the others who contributed, with the prattle of those who run the exercise emporiums for money and who are advertised as our greatest physical educators? Does one equate the sound advice on exercise coming from exercise physiologists such as Karpovich, Steinhaus, or Mayer with opportunistic entrepreneurs who would not know the myocardium from oxygen debt?

But we wander. Our problem is: What is the role of physical education in health and fitness? Let me see if my version of the answer comes anywhere near your version.

In the first place the need for activity on the part of the human organism has been well established. Documentation of this is unnecessary. The evidence is clear. Man is an active creature and activity is important to his growth, development, and survival. The need for exercise is here to stay.

But apparently nature does not care a bit how one ~~exercises~~ the activity needed. The "form" the activity takes is biologically unimportant as long as no harm is done. Run around the block, play football, dance a jig, or go climb a telephone pole. The heart does not care. Muscle does not care. The rectus abdominus, which is a pretty important muscle in maintaining visceral order against visceral chaos does not care whether it is used in basketball, bowling, or burglary as long as it is used. If muscular strength is what we are after to correct the evil ways into which we have fallen, nature does not care how we get it—or at what price. Strength-building activities can be anything that builds strength—and thus they need to have no other purpose, no other meaning, no discernible relationship to anything significant except strength itself.

I am afraid this is the sort of thing that some are calling "physical" fitness—a sort of muscular development that comes from exercise and that can be used for any purpose at the discretion of the possessor.

In these terms there would be relatively few problems involved in making the nation muscularly strong. Just set 40 million school children to exercising with sufficient vigor and keep them at it and we will accomplish our objective!

There are only two things wrong with this concept: Exercise is only partially responsible for fitness, and strength is only one of the concerns of physical education.

Our scientists, our philosophers, our educators, the better informed physical educators, and even our poets have proclaimed that there is more to fitness than

muscle strength. A conference of such people in 1956 described fitness as "that state which characterizes the degree to which the person is able to function."¹ It implies the ability of each person to develop most effectively his potentialities. And the conference agreed that fitness is maintained at a high level only if motivation is continuously present! This requires an inner desire—an egogenic stimulation. The activities that produce fitness must have meaning! The conference listed seven components of fitness, all of which are related to each other and are mutually interdependent. These are:

1. Optimum organic health consistent with heredity and the application of present health knowledge.
2. Sufficient coordination, strength, and vitality to meet emergencies, as well as the requirements of daily living.
3. Emotional stability to meet the stresses and strains of modern life.
4. Social consciousness and adaptability with respect to the requirements of group living.
5. Sufficient knowledge and insight to make sensible decisions and arrive at feasible solutions to problems.
6. Attitudes, values, and skills which stimulate satisfactory participation in a full range of daily activities.
7. Spiritual and moral qualities which contribute the fullest measure of living in a democratic society.

Now what does physical education have to do with fitness as described in those terms? Well, no relationship to all seven is the only thing that makes physical education physical "education." Otherwise it would be physical training—and there is a vast and uncomfortable difference between the two!

In the somewhat peculiar and not clearly understood combination of words *physical education*, the noun *education* becomes of great importance. It is not the same thing as training—physical training. Physical training trains, just as you train a dog or a pony. Kelley and Rasey say:

Much of our education is designed to train people rather than to educate them. When one individual trains another, he delimits the variety of possible responses, making the desired responses automatic and eliminating the possibility of other responses. We can train lower animals, but we cannot educate them. Training, limiting possible responses, is enslaving, while education is liberating. It is not that one is trained not to think, but that the act of training by its very nature delimits thinking. In the degree that the individual thus trained does think, he has been robbed of confidence in his own thinking.²

But physical education implies that someone, somehow, is being educated,

through the games, sports, and dance culturally important to our race (and it is important to know the difference)

To educate means to enrich the capacities of human intelligence. It means to help the individual gain increasing possession of himself and his powers; it means to recapitulate his culture, to deepen and widen its social content, to give him control over the methods of living within that culture. Some would say that the essence of education is the development of intelligence, of powers of thought, of the capacity for reflection, of human reason. The task of education is to develop the fullest capacity to take thought, to reflect, to weigh, to foresee, to consider consequences, to choose among alternatives. There may be other descriptions of education, but in the main they all describe a relationship between the learner and his environment in which the former is assisted to gain some personal control over and understanding of the latter by the cultivation of powers inherent within him. This is to make him fit in the terms the conference described. He learns to do this. He cannot do it as a child and as life goes on he develops his powers to the point where he can. Hulfish adds this thought:

The term learning may then be applied to any process within which potential stimuli become meaningful, change meaning, are discriminated with respect to possible meaning, and the like.¹¹

If we view meanings as the basic building blocks of learning, then any event that results in a reconstruction or reorganization of a meaning pattern may be called a learning experience. Any experience, then, which in consequence of its meaningfulness "increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" may be called an educative experience.

Now if physical education means that someone is educated through or by the "physical" experience, or in a "physical" environment, then the experience should be productive of the qualities described in the definitions. Can this happen? Does this happen? By accident or by design? Maybe it is that no education at all takes place through the physical education experience, at least in these terms. Perhaps this is not what the term *physical education* is meant to imply. Perhaps the only relation physical education has to education is that experience in physical education so conditions the organism that it can receive the stimuli that permits the student to become educated! This is the idea of the sound body in which to house the sound "mind." This is the ancient dichotomous view. This belies man's unity. To many persons in physical education and to many from other fields, other values from the physical education experience all loom larger and more important than the educational ones. Physical values come first—educational values a poor second, and only if something good happens to come along.

It should be clear, however, that if that point of view is held then it is hypocritical to use the term *physical education*. The term should be *physical training*, or *physical exercise*, or some other to describe what is happening. If *education* is the noun used, then a clear, reasonable, and demonstrable relationship to its substance must be developed in the physical education curricula. Someone must be educated. Educational outcomes must be sought, planned for, taught for, and obtained. They must be of prime concern, not secondary or incidental within a physical education program.

What kinds of outcomes could be considered educational? The answer is inherent in the question. Only those experiences that demand thinking will produce thinking! Only that kind of participation that requires the student to weigh, to reflect, to study will produce those qualities. It will not be likely that they will be produced by the kind of activity in which the participating individual does not become involved in some problem requiring solving, evaluating, thinking. Can a team have the chance to solve some of its own problems, or must the coach always direct the strategy, call the plays? Can a class become involved in seeking desirable outcomes from their work? Is social, religious, racial integration of consequence to students? What responses can be developed to cheating at games, sportsmanship, values in athletics, and to appreciation of good play?

Experience in a well conceived physical education program can aid in the solution of such problems. The understanding of integrative processes and the relationship of the physiological, psychological, and other functional elements to development can be enhanced through physical education. Comprehension of strength, ability, courage, daring, and skill can be developed. One makes progress in the solution of such developmental tasks as achieving skill in motor control and coordination, independence in self-care, learning to live in groups, and in relation to competitors.

An analysis of the effects of these experiences from physical education relate directly to the stated components of fitness, and this kind of physical education has an important relation to fitness and health.

But let us go one step further. There is perhaps no more compelling problem facing our educational system than that of deepening and widening our understanding of democracy. It has been said that our young people must be physically, mentally, and spiritually prepared for American citizenship.

How do you go about developing these qualities? By marching, drilling, exercising in groups and mobs under the impersonal supervision of an authoritarian drillmaster who counts the numbers while the victims pray they may be spared further boredom and when released from it vow never to have anything to do with physical exercise the rest of their lives? This is hardly a

satisfying experience in adaptability to group living, hardly productive of the spiritual and moral qualities needed to live successfully in a democracy! This sort of thing may temporarily produce some muscular strength but it is also very likely to produce emotional and perhaps even spiritual trauma.

To preserve the democratic way, to bring the oncoming generations into a clear understanding of its meaning, to develop a deep and unmistakable sensitivity to what democracy really is—this is a compelling challenge. The program of physical education cannot afford to be caught napping in this respect, nor can it be found guilty of teaching by precept or practice the ways of behaving and thinking that are characteristic of authoritarian regimes.

We have said that schools in general and physical education programs in particular have always been used as instruments of political and social power. One shudders at the memory of the marching Hitler youth—fit, strong, singing their way through exercises and sports so they could better reflect the marching ruthlessness of the most inhuman regime the 20th century has known.

What social and political purpose then does 20th century American physical education serve? It cannot be culturally neutral. Opportunities abound in the physical education program to provide experience with democratic processes. It should be clearly said and clearly understood that as long as physical education remains an element in the curriculum of a school or college that is dedicated to the perpetuation of the democratic way no teaching or administrative practice may, with conscience, demonstrate other and contrary values. The autocratic empirical administrator is as bad as the authoritarian teacher or coach. Each is a menace, in his or her own way, to the planned intellectualized approach to the perpetuation of democracy through the schools.

In some programs the students all wear the same kind of uniform, go through the same exercises, count the same cadence as they march, respond with the same imposed replies, affect the same posturing as they go through their exercises. They conform. The standard is set. The motive comes from outside, from above. It takes no intellectual response to "count-off" and to wave one's arms about in a calisthenic drill aimed at "physical condition."

It does, however, require self-initiated intellectual response to figure out the strategy of a game and execute it, or to compose a dance, or to plot the course for an overnight hike. It requires self-initiated activity to practice what one has been shown on how to swim or how to kick a soccer ball. This type of activity must come from within and be willingly chosen as a rewarding experience. This sort of activity is within the cultural tradition of a free people.

The opportunity is here. Modern physical education can serve as an educa-

tive experience or it can frankly and honorably renounce its claims to education and direct its energies to producing the sound body in which to house the sound mind. There is something pathetically unscientific about that effort but there is nothing dishonorable in it—except that it must not use the term *physical education*.

But to seek the integrative development of the whole man, to be as concerned with his ethics as with his physiology, to be helpful in his interpretations of motives, to aid him in his understanding of human nature, to help explore those deep wells of yearning within himself, to help him see that excellence is not measured wholly by scores—these are some of the other outcomes within the reach of a well planned physical education curriculum.

And so we, at any rate, believe the role of physical education in health and fitness is clear—and important. It is indispensable to both. Physical training, on the other hand, or merely muscle exercises for strength alone may, paradoxically, be destructive of the many things they are designed to help. By their sheer meaninglessness and potential for boredom, and because they are almost invariably terminal experiences, and because they offer no intrinsic appeal, they may be so regarded by the self-directing individual to drive him away from any desire to be fit or from any practice that may contribute to his fitness.

We must be careful, not merely enthusiastic. Not just any activity as long as it produces sweat and strength is educative in the rational interpretation of that word. From modern physical education programs we expect lasting values in continuous participation—an accumulation of "fitness scores" is not only insignificant compared to this but may actually be defeating this goal.

NOTES

1. "AAHPER Fitness Conference," *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 27, no. 6, Sept. 1946, p. 8.
2. Earl C. Kelley and Marie I. Ravey, *Education and the Nature of Man* (New York: Harper, 1952), p. 106.
3. H. Gordon Hullfish and Philip G. Smith, *Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education* (New York: Doubleday, 1961).

On Learning Values Through Sport

Now, no fair peeking! And thus came to us the first admonition to assure our conformity to the standards of conduct with which games have been played in our land. We were not supposed to peek! Anyone should know that. The game—what was it?—ten steps or hide-and-go-seek—presumed a code of honor mandatory upon us from the first instant we heard the rules. There were to be no exceptions. One simply did not entertain the idea of cheating. One went full-out for one's own honor and later for the honor of one's own school. After all, there were only two fates worse than death, and one was to be caught cheating at games!

With some reason, one might believe that this successful transmission of acceptable or traditional ethical values has been one of the reassuring and remarkable phenomena of our age. One comes to games, whether stickball in Manhattan or duck-on-the-rock in Grand Island, with the understanding that there is a way of doing this, and one would not, either as a matter of principle or for self-preservation reasons, be one to violate the code. "Play fair," "give him his turn," "I moved my ball in the rough," "I touched the channel marker with the tip of my boom," have become the confessions or commands heard by all and sundry as the standards of gentle folk have been transmitted through the games and sports of our people.

Games have thus been touched with a deserved halo of honor. They have become significant in life as experiences a bit different from the market place.

Published in *Quadrant*, December 1963, pp. 23-29

When once the gladiator (or marbleshooter, or rope-skipper, or tennis player) sets foot on the field of play the count is assumed to be correct. The "call" will be without favor or advantage, the chips will fall where they will, and if he loses because of the inexorable forces at work he will withhold his tears and his alibi, acknowledge the superiority of his opponent, and later, join him in a toast and song to the happy days of friendly contest!

Not yet has the cynicism or "nice guys finish last" penetrated *all* of sport and destroyed its virtue. Not yet has the sportsman who plays with honor and with respect in his heart for the traditions of the game and the rights of the opponent disappeared from the scene.

But almost. Games and sports are rapidly losing their simplicity of former days. They command now the attention of millions—of people and dollars. Fortunes are made from them. Reputations built or ruined. The sporting goods industry grosses within the top ten. Organized athletics in schools and communities have moved from the simple pleasures of a Yale-Harvard boat race to the spectacles of Canton-Massillon or the Cotton Bowl. Much is at stake—including the quality of morality that pervades the phenomenon.

And there is cause for alarm. No longer are all the games played on the high plane of respectability. There has crept into the program elements of immorality and greed which bid fair to spoil the fun. And it will take more effort on the part of many people to stem the tide of anti-morality and anti-intellectualism which is presently engulfing sport as it is engulfing many other aspects of our cultural, political, and social existence.

Organized effort? Teach ethics—or morality—by organized effort? Well, let's examine the case for it.

How have any of us arrived at our present level of ethical behavior? How have we achieved the values we live by? Mainly by observing example and partly by responding to teaching and the force of law. We can remember being good boys and girls long enough in Sunday school to reflect upon the startling news that "blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." So we were somewhat perplexed and shocked a little when the noted sports authority, Mr. Dorochev, was quoted as saying that "nice guys finish last."

Nor can we fail to be impressed with Norman Cousins when he points out how casually we regard violence, whether it be in games, traffic, or war, and shows us how we completely repudiate the admonition to turn the other cheek or to love one's enemies in such situations.

It is going to take organized effort because of the great and powerful

influences at work today bringing games and sports to their knees in a brutal assault to turn them into instruments not useful for perpetuating the gentle skills of friendly intercourse. They now can be powerful media for greed, bribery, and perhaps worst of all the dominating egocentrism of him who would use others not as Kant would have them used— as ends withal— but through the particularly immoral exploitation for ends which are *not* their own. In some quarters, if we hunger and thirst after righteousness it is becoming a little more difficult to be filled.

The case, as I see it, is alarming. Charlie, my neighboring twelve-year-old, is ready with his alibi if he loses a bike race. He must save face. It does not dawn on him that Benny may have been faster. Parents in Little League and high school sport are becoming notoriously poor sports. The coaching from the bench (distinctly against the rules) in big-time football influences thousands in little-time football. A midwestern college athletic director and president knew of an All-American's scholastic ineligibility his sophomore year but by duplicity he continued to play until his eligibility was used up two years later! The cynicism of players, coaches, commissioners, and newsmen associated with tournaments and championships invariably increases in volume as the gate swells and the audience enlarges. "Amateur" college athletics have all but disappeared, leaving only the tears of a lamented Whitney Griswold or an irate Lewis Mortill. Bowl games multiply. To deny one leads to a display of bad temper on the part of the aggrieved press, alumni, and students whose ethical standards are no higher than will allow them to throw bottles through the windows of the building where the faculty had voted to deny the darlings a chance to win—and thus gloat.

It is not a pretty picture.

But it ought not be surprising that it is not pretty. Because the decline in morality in sports, the abandonment of those sweet virtues of our polite childhood, are all related to the major transition taking place in the character of our culture.

Richard Hofstadter, in that realistic tome *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*,¹ traces this disease through our religious institutions, our politics, business, and education. He traces the beginning of the decline of the respect for the gentleman to the attacks on Thomas Jefferson, and he makes it clear that the learned man or woman, the nobleman and his principles of conduct, the gentility of the aristocrat has given way to standards of the mob and the mob. None of us has escaped, and some of us are bruised from this tidal wave of anti-intellectualism and anti-morality which holds our schools suspect of everything from the teaching of the doctrine of racial equality (of all things) to dealing realistically with the true nature of the democratic process!

To stem this tide is the greatest challenge confronting us all in education—and surely, it confronts us in physical education. Where better than on the playing fields and in the gymnasiums of our schools and colleges can we demonstrate and evaluate the dynamics of ethical judgment? Our rules of the games *do not* and *cannot* govern human conduct completely. Any more than can legislation guarantee equality of opportunity among men. As Martin Buber would put it, the demands of authentic existence mean that man cannot blindly follow the prescriptions of law but must accept an “ethic of responsibility,” in which moral action is a response to what the situation demands at a given time.

For one, for example, if we have not instead completely the “competitive spirit” as it flows so brightly in our culture. Competition has made us great—competition with nations, with nature, and with our fellow man. But we seem to have confused the use of competition as between war and sport. To be sure of it we frequently compare the two by speaking of the invaluable training for sport one gets out of combat or by claiming, as one famous athletic figure did, that the best combat officers come from the ranks of letter winners in college! Maybe so, but there is a discrepancy. Competition in modern war holds no place of honor for the opponent. He is to be killed by the silent means of a missile or a bombet high overhead in a conspiracy of silence of which Nietzsche would have approved because it gave no hint of its actual aim or purpose.

Games are getting like that. We hold secret practice, we hold secret meetings. We learn to hit ‘em hard and where they are weak, and if we don’t exploit the other’s tender feelings we miss a bet. All this is, as Mencken would say, because we are fatally insecure, so uncertain of the outcome of the game, so fearful that we may lose that we have no honor to display because honor is predicated upon a feeling of absolute security.

But competition can have another quality. It is, after all, not an end in itself but merely a means. Being a means, it must never become so useful as to overshadow the need for developing mutual respect among men. If the very essence of the democratic way is not respect for personality—then what is it? And any device or practice that teaches the young to hate, to spit upon, or to goad the liberty needs examination to determine whether the means have grown more important than the ends. Competitive sport can be a fine tool for teaching democratic morality, or it can, with equal facility, become destructive of it. To paraphrase Rousseau, those who would treat sport and morality apart will never understand the one or the other.

There are many violent critics of sports and of the school which so often carries sport through the academic portals—the program of physical education. Why does Robert M. Hutchins so tartly oppose any effort to make a learning experience out of these activities? Why would Hester, or Fadiman, or Mayer

hold little respect for the attempt to claim educational virtue for modern physical education? Why does even a blue-chip educational statesman like James Bryant Conant find a place for physical education in the curriculum only because there is allegedly a body-building influence involved somewhere therein?

Could these phenomena possibly have resulted from the most effective effort at self-destruction any group of well-meaning educators have engaged in in this century? It seems actually that there has been a conspiracy *not* to conduct sport programs upon an educational level, *not* to teach seriously the ethical aspects of sports, but to deny the educational implications of physical education in face of a single concentration upon values in exercise alone.

Perhaps it is, in the long run, impossible for people in the field of physical education to deal with more than one value at a time—and, if forced to choose, the value of strength and sweat, being the easiest attainable, will be the most widely advertised.

With such a single value as the only one in view, the impresarios of games are free to conduct them at any level they wish ethically and educationally. As long as the illusory value of "physical fitness" is sought, no other standards need to be met. Neither personal satisfaction, nor social competence nor continuous participation need to be sought. The anti-intellectual has taken over completely.

Perhaps games will never be returned, even in part, to those who play them or to those who see them as instruments for educational development but will remain forever in the hands of the one who gets the best price he can out of the schedule. Perhaps there is no end to the wild distortion of purpose. Consider, for example, the sorry plight of our modern interpretations of "amateurism." If we had any respect for the English language (and for our moral effect upon the young) we would understand clearly that probably only 5 percent of high school and college athletes today are "amateurs" in any decent interpretation of the word. The rank anti-ethic involved constrains the athletic administrator piously to claim amateur status for the subsidized athlete and suggests that there still may be a social or academic stigma to the professional!

In this day of subsidy? What nonsense! Let's face it morally, not in some pseudo-legal "amateur code." A boy or girl who gets as much as a free meal is no longer an amateur but may and usually does remain a splendid gentleman or lady. Let's abandon this immortal make-believe of piety with which we color our concept of "amateur athletics."

Perhaps the academic eyebrow is raised at sport, and its badly named family

physical education, because of the internally generated confusion relative to the discerned ends of its efforts. This confusion is patently self-destructive.

For years physical education programs had been moving rather steadily toward accent on the noun. They had been exploring the ways experience in vigorous movement could be used for total development, to recapitulate the culture of our land, to bring the individual into possession of himself and his powers. The exploration was mainly in the area of social and psychological development because these were relatively unexplored fields and the biological virtue of exercise has been well known for years. Exercise is important to life and living. It is here to stay. Only academic fools are oblivious to that.

But what we needed in physical education was full-blown research and clinical experience in the relation of movement to the teaching of ethics and morality, to the improvement of psychological states, and the cultivation of social gain among people and groups. These we need and these we are not getting because of the immoral stand we take of being glad to cultivate the sound body as the babysitter to the sound mind! We must follow the leader, sweat profusely, walk fifty miles, do our push-ups, patronize Vic Tanney and Bonnie Prudden, and thus will our population be made strong. Morally? Psychologically? Ethically? Socially? Or just muscularly? What are the great needs for successful life in our society? What kind of manpower does our society need for its preservation? This is the compelling question from the standpoint of national need, and people in physical education had better have an answer or they will be lost in the oceans of sweat recommended by the muscle-building anti-intellectual.

But who was John Dewey? To refer to him is risky business in today's world of the Far Right and the dynamometer! He once said that "The serious threat to our democracy is not the existence of foreign totalitarian states. It is the existence within our own personal attitudes and within our own institutions of conditions similar to those which have given a victory to external authority, discipline, uniformity, and dependence upon The Leader in foreign countries."

It is within the repudiation of those idols that we will find the ultimate and eternal strength of free men in a free society. The individual to be educated is a social individual. He lives not alone as a recluse but in a society that is an organic unit of individuals. If we eliminate this social factor we are left with only a pulsating mass of protoplasm sans direction, sans purpose, sans reason for being.

No wonder Hutchins and his group snobbishly advise parents to avoid colleges where physical education is required. He knows that as likely as not the

students may be asked to climb ropes ad nauseum or respond seriously to the pseudo-intellectual "fitness" expert who prepares the tables of "fitness" from dynamometers and rope climbs. No wonder. This sort of thing has about the same relation to the educational program as fertilizing the soil with worms does to raising flowers. It may have a part to play but it is a small one and a dubious one at that!

What we in physical education must come soon to understand is that no one, but no one, will take us seriously until we begin to take ourselves seriously and become truly intelligent about exploring the contribution that the world of sports, games, and dance can have to the *education* of man.

Can this world have a bearing upon the Christian ethic? Or any other ethic? Is it to be taken seriously as a means by which the accepted moral standards of the group are to be passed on? Can it be an effective experience in the enrichment of judgment about relative values? Can it help in decision making?

Well, it always *has* had a bearing on these things since man first taught the young through the game and the dance. But right now—when we have organized a program we call physical education, brought it into the school, used motor movement as its means and media—we need to get down to the business of teaching the behaviors this society of ours expects if it is to survive. We need to eliminate the casualness of the "Oh, I say Old Boy, that's not done" approach. We need to get serious about a search for our *total* potential, not merely our muscular.

This country is not going to be saved—or destroyed—by muscle, but by the quality of its moral fibre. What greater challenge can programs of physical education rise to meet?

NOTES

1. Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Knopf, 1963).
2. John Dewey, *Freedom and Culture* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939).

The Discovery of Personal Values

It can be assumed without much dispute that all of you have an interest of one kind or another in sport, games, and perhaps dance. Either you play yourselves, or you teach others to play, or you are planning to teach these activities. So we can assume that you must believe them worthwhile or you would not be spending your time in this sort of thing, and I daresay, you would resist any effort to abolish these things as a part of the experience of a college woman. Because you have some feeling about their importance in the life of a college girl, I often wonder, wherein lies this value? Is this merely a pleasant sort of thing to do to while away one's time between the more important academic pursuits of the college classes? Is it merely, or are they merely, prime sources of fun in which you can engage when there is nothing else to do—something to occupy, in a pleasurable way, the leisure hours? Perhaps there are some who view participation as being good for one physiologically. Then there are those who see successful participation in these kinds of activities as a status symbol. The question we might raise, however, is whether or not participation in the games, sports, and dance normally found in college life has any real bearing upon the fiber of the personality in the making, upon the woman, upon the total human being.

Personally, I prefer to think that it does. Let us build a case and see if we can find out just what sort of values might be derived from such participation.

Abstracted and adapted from an address delivered to the Athletic and Recreation Federation of College Women at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, April 10, 1963.

There is a wealth of evidence to support the idea that the human is a living entity, with biological goals very much the same as mental or behavioral goals. The famous Edward Sinnott, in a brilliant book entitled *The Biology of the Spirit*, makes it clear to us that goal seeking is characteristic of the entire organism and not just the spiritual or emotional or intellectual facets of life. Sinnott's point is that goal seeking is the *basic* characteristic of *all* of life, that body and mind are but two aspects of a fundamental unity which seeks goals. We are organisms in total, not simply mixtures of compounds, but a living, total architecture, no part of which is understandable except in relation to the whole. It is quite impossible and unreasonable to view ourselves as persons enjoying an emotional life unrelated to all other aspects of our being. It is quite unacceptable, in Sinnott's view, to consider the intellectual life as something quite different from one's physical life. Sinnott is trying to tell us that we do not exist at all in terms of these smaller parts—these fragmented areas of living function or of living protoplasm. He is saying that the physical and the mental, the emotional and the intellectual and the spiritual, are merely aspects of a totality, and they are all one and the same thing. He is saying that the expression of all of these aspects, united as they are together, is one of goal seeking. Whatever experiences we have—whether they be on the playfield or the swimming pool or in the library or in the laboratory—leave us marked. No experience leaves us unmarked. Thus, when we play and play hard, we may have a physiological return in terms of muscular strength or perspiration. But that physiological return is *only part* of the total return, *only part* of what happened to us as we played that game of hockey or swam that race. There is no behavior unrelated to what we truly are or to what we truly are becoming. We become what we live, and we live what we are.

Sport has for too long been shrugged off as merely a pleasant enterprise but not really related to some of the more recognized, formative influences in our lives—like Sunday school, for example, or like reading poetry, or reading a great play like *Cyrano*, or taking a very serious course in philosophy in college. We haven't particularly thought of sport in that rubric. And yet, the evidence places such participation as central to the total development of the individual.

From the earliest days, the influence of play has been a significant influence upon our development. It is in the field of play that we first learned the rudiments of the philosophical background of personal behavior as it relates to ethical behavior or ethical judgments. We first learned the meaning of "no fair" or "I dare you" or "you're chicken," and we reacted, as little children, to those commands or characterizations as the beginning of our total reactions to the challenges of modern life. One imagines the bravery of a little Girl Scout as she plays a game of capture-the-flag or prisoner's base. She thrills with the excitement of it all and does not merely react in terms that we can use to segment her reactions as emotional or physical or intellectual. At her age, there simply is

no such segmentation. She experiences success or failure, excitement or boredom, and she identifies the value as pleasurable, satisfying, boring, or disagreeable. She thus seeks more or avoids future such experiences.

The Educational Policies Commission a few years ago challenged us all to see ways to cultivate what it called moral and spiritual values in schools and it presented these values in decalogue form.¹ It was a powerful challenge to educators in any field and particularly, I think, to physical educators because of the potential wealth of opportunity for the physical educator to cultivate such values.

The Commission cited human personality as the basic value. Physical education responds by preparing its teachers to be sensitive to individual differences in constructing programs for children, renouncing a former practice of selecting mass activities regardless of their relevance and expecting all to conform to the single pattern. Modern physical education sees its activities as means to ends, and the ends are the welfare and well-being of the children. The child of misfortune, the handicapped, the hypersensitive, the bashful, the maladjusted, the dub become worthy of as much attention as the skilled, the fortunate, the star. Physical education provides for all, because the enrichment of personality is supreme *regardless of the quality of the performance*.

Perhaps, as another value, we seek to be self-directed. We do not like always to be told what to do. Living as free people in a free society, we come to the idea that we would like to decide a few things for ourselves. We liked to cast off the supervisory antics of our parents when we were growing up, to decide for ourselves what to do in almost any situation. When a father asks a little boy, "Do you want me to help you figure that out?" he says, "No, I will do it." In this field of ours when someone begins to tell us what to dance or how to play a game, we sometimes like to say, no, let me figure this out for myself. This value is important. It is the value of self-direction, of developing independence.

We seek beauty, as another one of these values. We define beauty as whatever is in harmony with life, something that gives us no pain, is pleasurable, to which we react with inner excitement and a sort of absolute exultation—a choreography well danced or a dive well executed or a beautiful horse or a beautiful painting we have done. Beauty is a value unmatched. We seek such values.

Then there is the simple value of fun. So much of life can be, if we make it that way, dull and uninspiring and boring. Thus, when sport, with its moments of happiness and fun and joy and exultation, enters our life, it becomes an important value and ought not to be spoiled by the solemnity that so many people bring to it.

Then there is the value of a self-developed bearing. I remember a little girl who was the victim of some religious persecution that brought her to the point of tears. She was a bit different from some of the other girls in her community. But through the simple medium of a game of volleyball, at which she became expert, she found her place, her status. The other girls in the group, unthinking though they might have been, dropped off their prejudice against this one and accepted her as one of them. I remember the fat little boy who was jeered at, not happy with his architecture, who learned to do the forward roll and they cheered him when he accomplished it. He achieved his own particular niche of dignity through the simple activities of the playfield or the gymnasium. And then there was the lad who had come to the program afraid of the water. But a careful instructor took him in hand and taught him how to swim. As a result, the lad went to the instructor at the end of the term and said, "Thank you. I'm glad you taught me to swim, because now, by golly, I can fish!" The instructor knew that this feeling of satisfaction, of achievement, meant something to him, because the boy was blind, and he couldn't fish from a boat until he could swim.

Then there is the value of being able to make a decision. What to do—to do something right or something wrong, to do something sporting or something mean.

The Commission held that if the individual personality is supreme, each person should feel responsible for the consequence of his or her own conduct. Children play volleyball. In that game one who inadvertently touches the net while making a shot calls a foul upon himself. There are some who think such behavior remarkable. In this day and age why not get away with as much as possible? Yet morality is not a question of being caught at cheating. To teach children in games to tell the truth, to accept responsibility, to call the penalties themselves, and not to evade—such teaching will make the physical education experience a moral force.

If the individual personality is supreme, institutional arrangements, the Commission said, are the servants of mankind. This means that administration in physical education—the rules and regulations, the schemes for attendance taking, the little leagues and organizations, the clubs and groups—exist not as ends in themselves but only to serve the child and the group. The rule is but a point of departure. In conflict with human value, the rule, the administrative device, the arbitrary authority gives way. Only thus can we see the human personality in its hallowed perspective as superior to all institutional organization. Ours is a moral culture. Thus, administrative practice in physical education must, to be a true part of this sort of value system, be responsive to human need.

Mutual consent is better than violence. Children can be taught to talk over

their disputes rather than fight over them. The vision of 11 adolescents standing belligerently over the prostrate form of the twelfth, whom they had just kicked into insensibility, is a reminder of the cruelty visited upon human personality when violence flares. The prostrate one merely wanted to go swimming in a public pool, but the mob said no. Possibly, if we could teach a concept of morality through physical education, we could deal more successfully with the wrangles, bickerings, arguments, and fights that have reduced some play experiences to the most unpleasant parts of the day. Can the Golden Rule be applied in play? Surely, but it must become a value of more worth than the sheer cold record of the score.

The Commission urges devotion to truth. Did the player step out of the court or did he not? Were you tagged or weren't you? Is it your turn or not? Did you score three runs that lining or four? Did you touch the net in that last volley or didn't you? What conceivable pressures are there on the field or court that make it necessary to condone the lie, the deception? If truth is desirable, then the multitude of chances for its expression in play must be utilized. There will be those who will debate its application anywhere in life. But if "the human mind is to be liberated by access to information and opinion," surely no stake in all of physical education, including the great college athletic contests, is worth condoning the distortion of truth and confusing or deceiving the human mind.

The physical education experience presents abundant opportunity for recognition and acceptance of truth both in its quantitative form (who won?) and in its qualitative aspects (did we play well?). It is, or at least it should be, hard to evade the truth on the field of play.

Excellence in character and creative ability should be fostered, says the Commission. Physical education responds by worshipping not mediocrity but the beauty and skill of the top performance, by encouraging a child to do his best and expecting the best he has. It fosters excellence and creativity in dance, in games, and in behavior.

All persons are to be judged by the same moral standards. There can be no special privilege in modern physical education. The same set of standards applies to the skilled and to the dub. The opportunity to teach such application is spectacularly real on the playfield. Special privilege of the strong, or the big, or the "home team," or for the excellent is unthinkable in a physical education experience devoted to moral values. What goes for one goes for all, and not to cheat at games becomes a primary lesson. And *that* has as much chance of transferring to other life situations as any other precept learned in any other context.

If individual personality is supreme, the concept of brotherhood should take

precedence over selfish interests. Sport in particular and physical education classes in general are excellent places in which to learn lessons in group acceptance. Special and unearned privilege assumed for any reason is wholly unacceptable where people play.

Each person should have the greatest possible opportunity for the pursuit of happiness. Physical education responds by conducting a program where the elemental satisfactions may be had, where success and acclaim are more prevalent than frustration and obscurity. It believes that each student can achieve success according to his own abilities, as he measures himself against discernible standards, and thus through his own efforts attains happiness. It offers joy, fun, contentment, pleasure. It hopes to avoid situations that provoke anger, resentment, or humiliation. Its activities are conducted in an atmosphere of friendly rivalry in which values are derived from the game and not from the anguish of a humiliated opponent.

Last, the Commission suggested that if individual personality is supreme, each person should be offered the emotional and spiritual experiences that transcend the materialistic aspects of life. Physical education can offer such experiences. It can bring to children the meaning of beauty as they dance their way through a colorful operetta, of joy as they thrill to the excitement of a relay, of the satisfaction of self-realization when they achieve the stunt they thought they could not do, of the confident feeling of courage well placed when they bravely correct an injustice in face of popular odds on the playground.

There is also the value we do not always note in our busy life of games and sport. We sometimes find people who just like to be quiet. They just like to sit at the edge of the sea or under the tree, dangling a line, maybe, where they can simply relax and, thus, grow in a sense of understanding of the total world in which they live.

All that I have just said is why we speak of the games and participation in sport and dance as media. Because such participation allows so much to develop in the human personality. I have always wanted to be somewhere near a vast playground, where perhaps a thousand people were participating on a sunny Saturday afternoon. I could see over there a softball game going on and someone successfully stealing second base. And over there, the horseshoe pitchers where someone had just topped a ringer. And over there, the swimming pool where many people were playing and having a marvelous time, just splashing around in the water. And, down the line a little bit, some children playing a rather elementary game and screaming and screeching in their excitement. And then, over there perhaps, on the far side of the playground, the horseback riders, just jogging along and enjoying an afternoon on their favorite mare. And then, coming out of the woods perhaps, would be the hunters, or

perhaps going into the next field would be a group of people with a soccer ball ready to engage in that exciting game. And then, across the way, in my imagination, I would see the ice-skaters, racing up and down the ice, chasing a puck in that fascinating game of ice hockey. Double that, triple that imagery—make it 5,000 people, make it 10,000 people, make it an unlimited number of people participating in the activities in which you and I have some interest. You would see the strategies, the behaviors, the exercise, the physiology, the heartbeat, the sorrows, the choices. You would see an appreciation of beauty, behavior. Because, all of these things involve all of the reactions of which the human being is capable. It is a fascinating mixture of motor experience and thoughtful analysis; of reflection and exciting movement; of sight, sound, and feeling; of exultation and sorrow; of greed, maybe, and anger; of humility and confidence; of fun and joy of learning about life. It must be clear that skill and talent and physiology are simply not enough. Neither is the scoreboard nor the gold medal. Because these activities assume their greatest dignity and importance when what we call the heart and the mind are lifted equally and at once by the creative union of perception and grace. All of this represents our contribution to the human spirit.

It is within such simple experiences as these that spiritual virtue is compounded. A child is not born with a full-blown set of values. He comes into them by living the daily incidents that have value overtones. His life on the playground, in the gymnasium, in the pool, and with teams or groups or a companion is rich with opportunities for cultivating these values. If the program of physical education does not recognize its potential influence, if it does not make the effort to teach personal values as strenuously as it teaches skill, it misses its greatest opportunity.

It presents a significant opportunity to go beyond the "physical" or the skill. But the important thing to realize is that forever and a day these values *have* been learned and are being learned in *these situations*! Whether anyone recognizes them or gives credence to their presence, they are there as an inescapable and indigenous element in the physical education experience. It is part of our racial heritage—part of our culture, part of our way of teaching and learning. John M. Trump recently gave us "A New Look At Teaching Moral and Spiritual Values."² He suggested ways. He provided book lists. The only thing he did not do was add the gymnasium and the playfield as classrooms or laboratories where this sort of human development can—and does—take place. The possibilities are as real in these situations—perhaps even more real—to live personal values in the physical experience than in most other places.

To sum it all up, the physical education experience, properly provided, is an educational one. It seeks to educate in the elements of personal development, self-direction, compatibility with group, and adaptation to national ideals. It

can do no less and remain within the educational heritage. It seeks strength and good health as the means useful in attaining those crucially important social goals. Strength without a declared and socially acceptable usage may easily be dangerous to the society we try so valiantly to preserve. "Human" values are golden in our moral society. Nothing may be taught on the playfield or elsewhere that subverts the best of those values.

NOTES

1. Educational Policies Commission, *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1951).
2. John M. Trump, "A New Look at Teaching Moral and Spiritual Values," *Ohio's Schools* 41, no. 9, Dec. 1963, p. 12.

Physical Education As a Rich Experience

The physical educator seeks to make changes for the better in human personality. Our gymnasiums and playfields are our laboratories. We hope the experience our people have within our classes will be a pleasant one, a constructive one, one that will draw them to physical education rather than repel them from further participation. We hope the experience they have with physical education will mean something to them for a long time. We hope the experience they have with us will be a rich one. We hope it will not be boring or meaningless or harmful or stupid. So to provide some guidelines as to the nature of a rich experience, let me propose these few characteristics of what a rich experience might be. A learned professor by the name of Edgar Dale once wrote an essay on the meaning of a rich experience. I shall paraphrase some of his remarks and perhaps amplify them in terms of physical education.

A rich experience will have a quality of novelty about it, of newness, of freshness—a sort of pleasant shock of discovery. To us this means that we might well plan, rather frequently, some new things to do, new games, new dances, perhaps even new freedoms, making choices, maybe perhaps new clothes and new colors, new anything. We ought not to bore students with the same old exercises day after day. Break up the routine. Let us even knock off participation in activity for two or three weeks and read something about sports or dance, do something different—show movies, take field trips, argue a point. The daily period over and over may very well be, in some instances, our albatross—it becomes too frequently a deadly, dull, and boring experience. A

rich experience will be something wonderful perhaps because it's something new.

A rich experience will have an emotional home base—something to get excited about, like Brahms' First, something that will make us stand and cheer and make us happy, something exciting like a game of football, or diving or skiing or sailing, something that had the excitement of when we first played hide-and-go-seek, something like figure skating on the overnight lake. There is no particular point in our getting so blasé about our teaching in physical education as not to get excited. Excitement is very significant.

A rich experience tells us something about ourselves. It involves an element of self-discovery, perhaps through achievement. "I made it," becomes an important cry of exultation: the time we won our Junior Lifesaving emblem, or we got our first hit in a softball game, or maybe we swam from here to the rock offshore, or maybe we did a good backup job in football or soccer that brought commendation, and thus we, in the quiet moments of our own life at home, recognized something about ourselves that we hadn't discovered before. There perhaps is something significant about the development of our self-image that involves pride.

A rich experience is something that leads to other experiences. We become interested in following this thing up; we learned to dance, perhaps in a physical education class, and that took us to a concert because we wanted more, we saw a movie on a television show involving Olympic skiing, and that took us out to the ocean, or we may have seen a water man from England, and that encouraged us to go to England; maybe we had our first camping experience, and that led us on to a lifetime of enjoyment in the out-of-doors. Unfortunately, there are so many activities recommended to us in physical education that seem to have no future to them. They are dull; they lead us not into anything that would be significant in our lifetime. These would hardly be called rich experiences.

A rich experience involves us wholly—our intellect, our judgment—gives us an opportunity for decision making. We do not want to do something over and over just because someone tells us to all the time. We do not want to do the same old drills or the same old boring activities of childhood. We want something fitting our intellectual and emotional development. We do not always want to have to get "physical" results. We want results in a broader form of intellectualism. It is difficult to evaluate this kind of experience; it is difficult to count or to measure or to test for it—but it is there.

I suggest that the rich experience will lead to other experiences in this same vein. If students like what they learn from us, they will go on to be lifetime participants in something. There are too many people who find physical

education a terminal experience. When they are finally released from the requirement, they give away their sneakers! What a pity! What a pity we did not whet their appetites for further exploration of *something*—fishing, camping, climbing, skiing, boating, *anything*! A rich experience leads to a lifetime of exhilarating participation, to self-realization, to achievement—not just as a child, but as an adult, not just to record establishment but to the deeper form of self-fulfillment, and not just as a school girl but as a mother of 50 years. We are talking about physical education in which in the rich experience people learn, become educated, learn to direct themselves, learn to become self-contained and no longer dependent upon the arrogance of the drillmaster or the coach who counts the cadence and tells us which muscles to stretch, which movements to make, and when.

Does Sport Have a Culture of Its Own?

Let us start out by discovering what I mean by sport and by culture. By sport I mean the myriad variety of sports as we see them in our society. I am not just talking about competitive, organized sport. I mean sport in its broadest terms—everything from highly organized professional football or the games of the National Basketball Association or Stanley Cup competition, everything from the sport of white water canoeing down the Penobscot or Snake Rivers, everything from pick-up basketball in the backyard to the state championships, from Saturday afternoon foursones to the Masters, from synchronized swimming to swimming on the family picnic, from hunting moose in Hudson Bay to squirrels in Ohio—the whole range. I am asking whether all of that sport together has a common culture of its own or fits into the culture of the people who participate. That is the big double question. Does sport stand alone as something unique in society or does it fit into and mirror our way of living?

What do we mean by culture? I have said it may be described as our way of living, the way we act toward each other, the way we behave, what we believe in, the standards we hold to, the things we hold dear and of good report. It involves a general quality of our total social and political systems.

Abstracted from an address delivered at the Texas State Convention on November 20, 1962, and at the 14th Biennial Convention of the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation at Fredericton, New Brunswick, June 22, 1965.

Does sport as we know it fit our way of life or is it something apart from it, with its own beliefs, its own ways of behaving, its own standards? There is speculation about the effect of wars, scandals in government, alteration in moral codes, broken "taboos," and resignations upon the values and standards of our population—especially upon our youth. Are we headed downward—or upward—morally and spiritually? Or are we merely creating a new set of values to fit our jungle-like atomic age? It is an age in which truth seems not to be in us, and the criteria by which we judge the social novelty of an act is epitomized by those who say "I didn't do anything anyone else wouldn't do—I just got caught at it!" The companion of that whimsical and vicious bit, in sport, is "What difference does it make what happened? We won didn't we?"

What does such a state of affairs mean to us in the conduct of sport in the schools and colleges of this country? If it is possible to link the sports program to the development of moral and spiritual fiber in the nation, we must recognize that the basic element of our society in democratic America—that is, the basic propositions upon which we construct our way of life—are couched in moral and philosophical terms. There have been many statements published to that effect in recent years, one of the most important of which is a paperback entitled *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools*, published in 1951 by the Educational Policies Commission of the NEA. The Commission makes it clear that the core of our society is the human being, and the structure of his community is a moral system operating through material phenomena. Thus, the analysis, examination, preservation, and perpetuation of our moral and spiritual codes—those values that exalt and refine life—is the principal business of us all today. It remains the great and continuing purpose of education. Unless sport in particular, and physical education in general, are to be constructed as programs unrelated to the social and moral culture of our people at large, we must pay heed to the specifics of the moral code and do what we can to operate our sports programs in their light.

It would be easy to ignore the basic tenets of our society and go our merry way in pursuit of skill, excellence, victory, and the other goals so dominant in athletics—that is, to ignore the potentialities of the field of sport and let the ministers and educators fret about the moral values. But we cannot do it. We in sport have accepted the development of the whole person as our field of operation. We say repeatedly that participation in sport is good for the total girl or the total boy. We have a relation to behavior, to sportsmanship, to fair play, to ethics. We have recoiled from the accusation that we are merely muscle builders. We have rejected the cult of muscle, and we have accepted the responsibility for the development of the whole individual. To deal with this individual, as an individual and in every aspect of his development, we must enrich his body of values as well as the value of his body.

Of what body of values are we speaking? In spite of the melting-pot nature of our society and in spite of the sometime conflict between pragmatism and orthodoxy, we have evolved some values which our people accept. These are the values set forth so clearly and so brilliantly by the Educational Policies Commission.

A reading of those specifics presents an inescapable challenge to all of us interested in athletics. They state that the basic moral and spiritual value in American life is the supreme importance of the individual personality. They make it clear that if individual personality is supreme, each person should feel responsible for the consequences of his own conduct. They make it clear that if individual personality is supreme, institutional arrangements—our rules and conferences and leagues—are the servants and not the masters. They make it clear that if individual personality is supreme, mutual consent is better than violence; that excellence in mind, character, and creative ability should be fostered. They echo our concept of democratic equality by suggesting that if individual personality is supreme, all persons should be judged by the same moral standards. The concept of brotherhood should take precedence over selfish interests. Furthermore, each person should have the greatest possible opportunity for the pursuit of happiness, provided only that such activity does not substantially interfere with similar opportunities for others. And last, if the individual personality is supreme, each person should be offered the emotional and spiritual experiences that transcend the materialistic aspects of life.

Is the development of such values beyond the scope of athletic competition? Are those of us in charge of sport unconcerned about the development of such values?

In my judgment, we are inescapably involved, and if we do not feel that involvement, we are guilty of adherence to a segmented development in which we are concerned only with physical values. If we teach contrary to those values, we then are subversive of the best moral values of our society. Therefore, we must teach these values. We cannot escape them.

Is it ethical for us to condone acts and attitudes of poor sportsmanship in sports at any level? There are some who fear that school and college sport are seriously menaced and facing degradation in the name of victory, or commercialism, or both. Does the cynical cry of the victor—"But we won, didn't we?"—erase all ethical or moral responsibility for how we won or at what cost to the moral fiber of the participants?

There is probably no field in all of education so replete with situations involving ethical behavior. Does one "steal the show" in the dance recital by the gesture or expression at the right (or wrong) time? Does one lie to the

referee, falsify the weight, move the ball, touch the net but fail to acknowledge it? Does one use the hands illegally or do any one of a hundred available things not in the spirit of the game?

There is grave danger that American games are being seriously degraded. The influence of professional sport is not particularly uplifting, especially ice hockey with its brutal personal attacks and fighting among players. The gold rush is on, and "nice guys finish last." Thankfully one still can see a really hot contest between two high school or college basketball teams played by gentlemen (or ladies) holding each other in respect and friendship. But too often the display of rudeness toward opponents and officials goes beyond all reasonable bounds—and there are about as many "witches" among the girls and women as there are "hotheads" among the boys and men.

The fist fight, the argument, the display of temper, the "show-boating," the alibi, the accusation, the outright cheating, the underhanded practice, the biased official, the "getting away with anything you can"—these are marks of degradation. How can we stem this tide? By sighing for the good old days? By staying home? Or by speaking out? By teaching in our physical education classes what ethical behavior is? Or would that take too much time from our "conditioning" exercises?

We can teach ethical values in our classes. But *should* we try? Why not leave those values to Sunday school or athletic banquets or the sports writers?

There is no clear-cut answer to the question, so let us begin with a premise that sport in any of all of its forms can and should reflect the best of our way of life, but that it also can, with thoughtless and subversive administration, become destructive of it. I am going to suggest that because some 90 percent of our population at some time in their life has participated in sport of one kind or another, that it is no idle, inconsequential phenomenon and that it does have something to do with our national culture.

In the first place, sport—participation in it or witnessing it—is important to young and old. It does something to us. It leaves its mark. It is an educational experience. We learn from it and through it and by it. In the second place, the situations that arise within it and from it are, for the teacher of physical education, glorious opportunities for teaching the social behaviors expected in our culture. There is a continuous interplay of personality, a continuous opportunity to learn about each other and about the group and about the large aspects of society. The situation presents a golden opportunity for the teacher who knows what sort of phenomenon he is dealing with. Sport can be a powerful force, one way or another.

Sport is important and must be preserved as a reflection of the best in our life, as a showcase of our beliefs, as a rewarding experience in human relations. It must not be limited only as a factor in the economic growth of our industry or merely as a pleasant recreational pastime of no social significance. Worse yet, it must not be degraded into internecine warfare with all the brutalities of the jungle, all the slashing, fighting, ego-centered quarrels of uncivilized people. It needs protection against its enemies and, principally, protection from its friends.

We are confused about it. We do not know, for example, whether to preserve the 19th-century conception of amateurism or to allow the economic factor of commercialism to enter into our contests. We know that the latter is inevitable. But we are having difficulty facing the inescapable responsibility of casting a new form of equalizing competition between groups. Amateur sports, as we knew them in the 19th and early 20th centuries, will disappear. We must somehow develop another way of equalizing competition, if that is our objective.

We are confused because we do not know whether sports have a place in school or college. In some areas, particularly in New England, for example, participation in sport carries no academic respectability whatsoever. It has no bearing upon the accumulation of academic credits or the winning of a degree. It happens to be considered a pleasant extracurricular enterprise. In other places, on the other hand, it carries full academic standing. Which is the better way to handle sport?

We are confused because we do not know exactly who should set the standards for conduct in sports or to what lengths any person or team or group is entitled to go in order to win. We do know that sport can be fun, like Saturday afternoon golf or tennis, or it can be as disgusting as we find it sometimes when we go to high school or college basketball games and are overwhelmed by the loud, raucous jeers and howls. Sport can be as adventuresome as a wilderness canoe trip or as nerve-racking as a hockey game. It can be as beautiful as a regatta or as hideous as boxing. It can be hard but politely fought, or it can be frightening and as devastating as a War of Roses or professional ice hockey.

We are not sure yet at what age participation in sport should commence or just what privileges should be extended to girls and women who want to participate in organized athletics. We are not quite sure whether "winning is all there is" or whether there is much more to participation than the search for the medal or the trophy.

To remove this confusion we must have certain criteria. Let me suggest four or five that seem basic to the cultural patterns under which we live.

First, we have believed since the beginning of this country that each person is entitled to an opportunity to progress, to become educated, to live. We call it equality of opportunity, and we have constructed our great educational systems upon that cultural pattern. It is important to us. To extend that into every aspect of our lives—from education to housing to economic opportunity to protection to health opportunities—becomes one of our basic philosophical shibboleths with which we wage our peaceful coexistence.

Second, we believe distinctly in what LaPierre and others have described as the Freudian ethic, which involves the abandonment of blind allegiance to authority and substitutes for it the assertion of the right of the individual to make decisions. Thus, we in physical education or in sport need to emphasize that the decision to go "out" or to go along with the practice of the group belongs to the individual placed in that situation. We have rejected the authoritarian type of activity in physical education precisely because we have found it did not assume any compatibility with the right of the individual to make up his own mind, to arrive at his own decision, to do what he thinks is best, to participate as he sees fit. We have established certain values as central as a result of the influence of some of our forefathers, such as Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, who have helped us to establish the idea that individual personality is the supreme value in a democracy. That has been clearly stated by the Educational Policies Commission and by many of our great leaders in education. And thus, the central criterion for judging value is how it affects the individual. The central purpose of any social unit is to further his best interests. How does sport embrace that particular idea? How does the everyday administration of everything from Little League baseball or hockey to college and high school sports for girls and boys measure up to that particular standard which is basic to our society? Does sport as you know it remain within that framework?

Furthermore, our society is essentially a moral society. Many have suggested that the essential force that makes things go has been a system of values based upon the old-fashioned term, a system of morals. The Declaration of Independence made that clear when it embraced the pursuit of happiness as one of our objectives. The Educational Policies Commission makes that clear when it urges us to seek as one of our basic outcomes of an educational system a devotion to truth. What does sport have to do with that? In the very beginning, in childhood sports, we teach youngsters not to cheat, to be fair in their play. As we go into the more highly organized sports, we have rules to be observed, and cheating is frowned upon.

Next, it should be clear, as President Pusey of Harvard once put it, that the significant struggle between good and evil is not in society but in the individual. The Educational Policies Commission insisted, echoing that point of view, that every individual be responsible for the consequences of his own conduct; that

every individual learn to stand up and be counted. No excuse, because the crowd does it, is valid. There is no way we can justifiably and rightfully place the blame for our conduct upon the system under which we operate. The institution cannot be substituted for the individual. There is no point in saying that everybody does it and therefore it is okay for me. There is no way we can possibly escape the responsibility for the character and quality of our own conduct.

Then we believe that achievement is a *means* and not an *end*. It is not how high you can jump but what kind of a person you are because you jump that high. It is not a question of how fast our Olympic athletes can run or what the score is in a tennis match or by what margin we won a championship. It is not a question of the quantitative distance or time. It is a question of what happened to the individual who participated as a result of that participation. Participation is a means by which we develop the personal qualities in the given individual. Batting averages are of no account until we know what kind of person was produced as a result of that batting average. I have always liked the conception of President Bixler of Colby College as to the simple and basic purpose of an education, which he describes as "to teach the individual to distinguish between the good and the beautiful and the cheap and the shoddy."

Can we do something of that sort through sport? I am perfectly sure we can.

The development of sport throughout our land in terms of the wide range of its variety is a clear demonstration of what we mean by equality of opportunity. We seem to be progressing to the point where we are recognizing that sport is for everyone. Through the development of our splendid recreational systems of our cities and states; the development of our state, county, and national parks; the development of our programs of all sorts from elementary school through college and into adult life, we seem to grasp the idea that everyone is entitled to a sport. We have lowered barriers among races and ages and sexes. We are gradually moving to the point where there is no person living who needs to come into this world feeling that he is barred or does not have access to a sport of his choosing. That effort must be continued so that sport does become a living, vibrant manifestation of equality of opportunity.

We do see sport as a prestige field. We applaud achievement. We give honor to our stars. Yet we must never allow sport to fall into the category of belonging only to the social or athletic aristocracy. We have done our best to discard the terms *major* and *minor* in describing sports in school or college. We recognize that what is minor for one is major for another and vice versa. The only criterion by which we judge the value of a sport is what it means to the individual who participates. We believe that we can teach a distinction of the good and the beautiful from the cheap and the shoddy, by developing appreciation of friend-

ships, camaraderie, the development of all the virtues to be found in the clean, healthy play of young people. What an opportunity it is to develop friendships, and how sad it is when people conduct sport in such a way that the competitors never see each other, never develop the friendships potentially there.

But I presume that, like all good things in life, sport must be protected from its friends as well as from its enemies. There are those who would remove sport from our culture of a democratic nation and develop for it a culture of its own or, worse yet, affiliate sport with some alien or heathen culture.

It is not difficult to identify some of these destructive influences now in some of our sports programs. Let me mention a few of them. We seem to be developing a cult of personality. We recognize the temptation for anyone who is successful in sport to be a "colorful" player, to be a show-off, to be good copy for the media. And those people become the standard for others. They cover their weakness with their idiosyncrasies and their individual peculiarities. They use sport merely as a way to satisfy their insatiable appetite for public notice. I think, for example, of the ranting and raving of the coaches we sometimes see on the sidelines in competitive sport, those who wear peculiar clothes, calling attention of the crowd to them. In contrast are those coaches who sit quietly on the sidelines allowing the players and the officials to conduct the game. I am thinking of some of our tennis players who seem to be flagrantly impolite and who seem to want to allow their personality to dominate and to color not only their performance but the performances of others. The flamboyant pitcher in a baseball game, the slashing, cruel, offensive ice-hockey player, the curious football player who for one reason or another is not satisfied to let his play speak for himself but wants to develop the idea that he himself is the game. He loves to be called "Mr. Football." He looks on his sport as show biz.

Then there is the cult of the impersonal. There are those who conduct sports as if they are really not engaged in by human beings but by inanimate or animalistic objects. The football coach deplures the fact that he doesn't have "the horses." Or he says, "I don't care how you do it, just get it done." Or he suggests that the score is the only thing that counts and that no matter how we won, "We won, didn't we?" Sport thus becomes an experience in the impersonal, and the players become a faceless hoard—chattel to be used in the accomplishment of any purpose, regardless of its relation to the developing personality participating in it.

There is also the cult of violence. We have seen a great deal of that lately. The riots in our basketball games because of the violence, both oral and physical, which seemed to be expected and taken for granted in some sports. There seems to be little attention paid in some sports to teaching either sportsmanship or good manners or plain country hospitality. I dislike the mean

things we sometimes do—like tearing off the chin strap in football and hiding it in order to get time out, or kicking the ball away from the second baseman, or moving in tennis to distract the one who is serving or drawing the other team offside in order to get an advantage, or intentional fouling in basketball. There are dozens of little things we do in order, by one means or another, to achieve the victory.

Then there is the cult of the immoral, of pretense, of something less than truth. One loses a ball in a golf match and blames the imperfect rough. One intentionally misses a call in tennis. One does not adhere to an amateur rule. One deliberately cheats or gets an undeserved advantage.

We see also the cult of injustice. The best example was the practice of not so many years ago of the great collegiate athletic association known as the NCAA, in which penalties for infractions of rules were placed upon the wrong people. Whole teams, whole universities and all of the teams representing that university were placed on probation or placed on penalty, when actually the infraction was produced only by one or two or three persons. This was a direct violation of the basic laws upon which our judicial system is based. Unfortunately, injustice works its way in and through many of our athletic institutions.

Last, there is the cult of the solemn and the serious, in which the coaches at a sport event sometimes would have us believe that there is a religious overtone to their activity. They call their players together for a solemn prayer, or they are solemnly interviewed by media representatives and act as if this were not just a game but a test of whether the country itself will survive. Even some of our national organizations feel that anyone who criticizes their administration is desecrating a fundamental institution.

Are we permitting sport to develop a culture all its own, in which certain things are permissible which would not be acceptable in society as a whole? Are we permitting certain practices, certain customs, certain ways of doing things to develop in sport which we would laugh at or hold in ridicule or actually frown upon in society at large? Are we taking our sport heroes too seriously? Are we assuming that to win a championship is much more important than almost anything else in the world? Are we assuming that a successful coach—that is, one whose boys or girls have won a championship—is some sort of a demigod, to be honored and praised and showered with medals and trophies beyond all decency? Have we really developed sport to the point where it is blown clear out of proportion to some of the other activities we carry on in our communities? Has our talent for organizing sport actually taken some of the fun out of it? One shudders, sometimes, when one watches a Little League baseball game, to see how extravagantly serious some of the parents take that game and how abusive they become to their boys or girls when they have lost. Will our

greed, our ego needs, ruin sports? Or will they be preserved for all, and become the possession of all of our people who can have fun and the pleasure and the thrill out of participating?

I like the comment from Herbert W. Wind, made years ago, in which he said he was afraid that we were allowing the spirit of sports to go out of sports. He suggested that sports were full of humor and fun; they were spontaneous. They were an experience, perhaps, in making contact with something idealistic in our nature when we were young and when the poet in all of us blossoms wordlessly in a genuinely sporting atmosphere.

If we allow sport to develop a culture of its own, that culture may be a culture of blemish and discord and brutality and violence. It can, however, mirror the brilliance of our own worth. It can mirror the fun and the pleasure that we so desperately want to hold onto in this changing and frightening world.

272

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE in the HPER LEADERS SPEAK series . . .

CONCEPTS AND CONVICTIONS

Del Oberteuffer, an eloquent spokesman throughout his many years of dedication to the achievement of excellence in both physical education and health education, speaks out again to the profession in this volume—sharing his thoughts and feelings on the education of the whole person, mind and body. This is a stimulating collection of articles by a renowned authority in both fields. "In no instance," he says in his preface, "did any audience or any class get less than my best." The contents of this book, recommended for all who are involved in health education and physical education, reflects that emphasis on excellence. 1977.

HPER OMNIBUS

A compilation of ideas, thoughts and beliefs of 16 recipients of the Luther Halsey Gulick Award—the highest honor accorded by AAHPER to its members. Transcribed from the original audiotapes developed as a part of the Alliance's "Tape the Leader" project, they include contributions by Ruth Abernathy, Dorothy S. Ainsworth, Rosalind Cassidy, Elwood Craig Davis, Margaret H'Doubler, Clair V. Langton, William Ralph LaPorte, Mabel Lee, Minnie L. Lynn, Helen Manley, Charles H. McCloy, Jay Bryan Nash, Neils P. Neilson, Julian W. Smith, Arthur H. Steinhaus and Jesse Feiring Williams. 1976.

MEMORIES OF A BLOOMER GIRL

Mabel Lee, the "first lady of AAHPER," recounts her early life from the naughty nineties to the roaring twenties, reflecting the patterns of a growing country and an emerging profession—physical education. Bloomers became the symbol of the career she was to follow—beginning with sports and dance as a grade school girl, continuing into high school and college at the turn of the century, followed by two years of professional training, and finally a glimpse at her teaching career in the World War I era. Celeste Ulrich, in her foreword, calls it "a tender, compelling, emotional, revealing, awesome story." 1977.

TO SEEK AND FIND

An intimate look at AAHPER's 1976-77 president, Celeste Ulrich, through a selection of 15 of her speeches over the past decade. Telling it like it is—or should be—in HPER, she's one of the profession's most eloquent spokespersons. Sometimes controversial, always thought-provoking, these selections are must reading for every student and professional in HPER. 1976.

VITAL ISSUES

Here is a series of speeches by Eleanor Metheny, recognized for her contributions in "intellectualizing" the field of physical education. They span 30 eventful years for the profession—1942-1971. Considered controversial and provocative at that time, the speeches reflect the "mood" and trends that were prevalent during those years. Emphasis is on the "whole person" with particular reference to affective, sensory, perceptual, cognitive, symbolic and meaningful aspects of experiences related to physical education. 1977.

For order information and prices, write:

AAHPER Promotion Unit
1201 16th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Some Things We Need and Some Things We Do Not Need in Sex Education

I liked the comment by W. G. Rogers, reviewing the recent memoir by Lillian Hellman, *An Unfinished Woman*: "A peculiar conceit of every generation—it may be the distinguishing conceit of the callow newcomers as they swarm up among us decade after decade—is that it discovered sex. This is one of the attitudes that render the young dull, incredible and amusing. In the flamboyant and boastful Sixties, however, thanks in part to the pill, the newcomers, rank upon rank, have reached further heights of arrogance. They lay out exclusive claims to the fullest, freest and busiest sex ever: like no one else in history, they are truly emancipated."¹

But not so! What any new crop of young ones needs to understand is that much of what they do we have always done. Exploration, promiscuity, fun and games have always been with us. So has need—for counsel and information. And likewise has fear—fear that if the young were taught well, enlightened about the mechanisms of the sex life, they would go to hell promptly and effectively. There always have been critics of the educator's efforts to

Delivered at the Joint Session of the American School Health Education and the School Health Section of the American Public Health Association at their annual meetings in Philadelphia, November 14, 1969.

Although the responsibility for what has been said in this paper belongs entirely to the author, he has been aided by such professional friends as Robert Kaplan, Wesley P. Cushman, Elena M. Sliepcevich, Marion Pollock, H. S. Hoyman, Ann E. Nolte, E. J. McClendon, Wilfred Sutton, Charles Richardson, Marian Hamburg, and Stanley W. Ellis.

inform—nasty, bigoted critics such as those who are spreading fear and suspicion today—those self-righteous accusers who get on their radios and write their pamphlets to scare nice parents to death with the spectre of ivory-toothed teachers leading their innocent mini-skirted virgins down the primrose path.

I get a little tired—but remain tolerant—of those who belabor the generation gap. Maybe there is one somewhere, but in sex education there's just a gap. It has always been with us—a gap between need and answer, between preparation and realization. Hasn't anyone ever read Oscar Wilde or Thomas Wolfe? Don't those fearful critics of ours, who must suffer such tortures themselves as to blind them to the nature of sex in normal life, know their social history? Haven't they read *Fanny Hill* or Homer or Thucydides, or seen *Lysistrata*, or heard of Plato or Euphonius? Both the youngster of today and the protective critic who would keep children perpetually in ignorant bondage must come to realize (but they never will) that there are no new problems, no new needs, and very little new information at the disposal of the educator.

Can we really say there has been a recent acceleration of interest on the part of young people in this area of their lives? I doubt it. Early studies in this century in Oregon, Ohio, Denver, and California showed students quite willing to state their concerns. One can easily gather that the young people in the 19th century had problems and interests largely unmet in any formal way in education. What we have today that we did not have before is a current willingness and enthusiasm on the part of teachers working in organized curriculum settings to get at some of these student problems and deal with them on a constructive, scientific basis. The decade 1960-70 has seen a lot of change in the number of schools willing to do some teaching in this area. The result has been the production of some outstanding teaching materials for use at every level. Advance here has been prodigious. The production of good books, teaching outlines, films, and other paraphernalia to aid the teacher has been almost more than we need. The college teacher no longer has to rely only upon Emslie Hutton's *Hygiene of Marriage* and a couple of pamphlets on venereal disease by the American Social Hygiene Association. Today the woods are full of excellent paperback and hardback resources.

To mention just a few: If one were to examine the teaching materials for Concept 6, "The Family Serves to Perpetuate Man and to Fulfill Certain Health Needs," prepared in 1969 by The School Health Education Study, one would find excellent teaching suggestions for all grades;² or the 36-page paperback *Growth Patterns and Sex Education* (a suggested graded outline) published by the American School Health Association in 1967;³ or the Study Guides from the Sex Information and Education Council (SIECUS);⁴ or some of the state courses of study such as those from California, Connecticut, New York, and a half dozen other equally good ones; or such publications as Helen

Manley's *A Curriculum Guide in Sex Education*⁵ and Esther Schulz and Sally Williams' *Family Life and Sex Education*.⁶ One would gather from these efforts a sound impression of their integrity and the conscience with which the educator is taking the responsibility to do something in the sphere of family life and sex education. The SIECUS newsletter alone lists enough good resources to keep anyone busy for a lifetime just reading the material as it comes out.

But 'twas ever thus: Every time we, in education, rise to meet a problem there are others from both within and outside the profession who try to knock us down. From Idaho and New York, California and Ohio, Kentucky and Pennsylvania, from all over the land of the free come efforts to control, restrict, or abolish sex education courses—an avalanche, a flood of opposition. Probably nothing has so stirred the antis since the Rugg textbook controversy spearheaded by the American Legion 30 years ago. It's a riot, and just as terrifying as Watts or Chicago; terrifying because of the realization that we really haven't come very far from the days of the Salem witch hunt. If we had, what would Dan Smoot or "Dr." Drake or the John Birch Society do for a living?

But good sense must and will prevail, provided we see clearly our needs and recognize equally clearly some things we don't need. Let me suggest several of these.

1. *We need to know what we are doing.* Strangely enough, lots of people do not. They just stumble and bumble into and across this volatile area, teaching little more than the mechanisms and geography of the reproductive system. We need to know that delving into this area gives the teacher an opportunity to organize a rich educational experience, exploring the most significant and important aspect of life. From childhood to old age humans have their problems—both personal and social—as they try to adjust themselves to a society with moral standards proscribing sexual activity. Good teaching, thus, must become more than the transmission of static knowledge that has no relevance to ongoing problems.

To affect behavior and to produce development are, in the long run, the principal goals of sex education, and to achieve these, much more than the anatomy of the parts is needed: We need to help in the resolution of the perplexities and mysteries of individual sexuality in childhood and old age and all ages in between. The person who says he or she has no problems, or no unresolved curiosities, or to whom all mystery has been stripped away, either deliberately prevaricates or is just insensitive or unaware. It is good to have help in how to adjust to the ramifications of sex in life at age 16 or 26 or 50, and if school counselors or teachers or school physicians can help, we call that sex education. It is good to be knowledgeable about pregnancy or less than terrified

at the first nocturnal emission or to be supported by standards and values as one feels the first temptation to do what seems to come naturally. It is good to know some things about the social problems of child neglect, child abuse and abandonment, illegitimacy and abortion. Discussion in these areas is within the broad scope of sex education. *Life* (June 13, 1969) devotes practically a whole issue to "Science and Sex in the New Morality."

How can anyone in his right mind fail to encourage schools to dig into this area so our young people will be prepared to act, to vote, to counsel their own children on these and other matters? To discuss such problems as predetermination of sex, designing offspring for special jobs and environments, the use of artificial insemination, generation without sperm or egg, the causes and prevention of divorce, the biological origins (or lack of them) in our religious or moral codes—these are all a part of sex education, and we ought to be dealing with these matters if we are not now. Teach about birth control, the population explosion, contraception? How can we miss as long as we know enough to stay within the existing legal boundaries and have the sense to recognize the existing but important community limits for such discussions? Who is going to prepare the ongoing generation to understand contraception so thoroughly that when the day comes when contraception is so cheap, so easy to prevent any risk of unwanted pregnancy, the youngsters will know how and why to act—single or married? I doubt whether the membership of the John Birch Society or seven eighths of the parents will be able to do this kind of teaching unless they get help from teachers, nurses, physicians, or other well prepared counselors.

Actually, there is so much to embrace, so much to talk about, so much to learn, to understand, that the teacher must simply read, study, and develop his or her own understanding far beyond any dilettante's efforts to teach little children where babies come from or to promise adolescent girls what kissing may lead to. The needs are clear, resounding, unmistakable, personal, and compelling.

2. *To know what we are doing requires that we know more than the needs people have for information and counsel.* We have to understand that teaching in this area is inescapably related to the great religious doctrines of every culture to be found in our pluralistic society. We may think we can teach sex education without being concerned about the Christian doctrines relating to chastity, monogamy, or divorce, or the Judaic or Moslem or any other religious admonitions about modesty or privacy or marriage customs—but we cannot. We cannot bring a discussion of boy-girl relationships or homosexuality or the nomenclature of the sexual organs out of the pages of a textbook, assign them to a class, and not be expected to relate to 15 or 20 centuries of religious and moral background. We must never forget that for most of our people church and family are stronger influences than school—at least in such a personal area as sex—and to ignore this strength is to invite trouble.

I remember very clearly a conversation I had 40 years ago with the director of public health in Ohio. He was a staunch Roman Catholic. I was seeking his endorsement of a plan to certify nurses as teachers in health education if they chose that course of preparation. The idea was new to him, and he wanted to know what in the world nurses would teach in a classroom. I mentioned the usual areas, and when I suggested they might teach something about sex he exploded. "Young man," said he, "no one except parents or priests should ever teach *any* child *anything* about sex."

Well, that is not an accurate reflection today of the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, but there was an encyclical produced by Pope Pius XI in 1929 that still more or less sets the boundaries for Catholic acceptance in this area. There is no use being unaware of that in particular or the attitude of the Church in general toward our efforts.

Our society seems to want to preserve chastity in the young. We want them to come to the marriage bed with no previous experience in sexual intercourse. We want them, once married, to stay married. Divorce is not yet a popular and wholly acceptable way to solve problems. And we do not yet condone adultery. Does a program of sex education contribute to the preservation of these three cultural objectives or doesn't it? Some say of course it does. Some say it doesn't. Which paper do you read? But if someone gets an idea that sex education will lead to the destruction of any or all of these three basic moralities there will be some—maybe many—in our communities who will call us to task. We have to know what we are doing and be able to come reasonably close to proving that we do it.

These three cultural objectives—chastity, monogamy, and the everlasting marriage—are the most deeply rooted patterns in our society. They are rocks upon which our society is built. They involve our whole concept of family, and our version of the family is the basis for our civilized society. We are not Samoans or Kenya tribesmen or even Frenchmen. We are what we are, with a heritage of puritanical reverence for the word of God, and His word is still a dominant force in the dynamics of our daily—and nightly—lives. We are not yet as hedonistic as the Romans.

Read Matthew 19:4 on divorce. Read the Sex—Sex Behavior entry in the *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Volume 4, page 297. Here are the strong origins of our cultural attitudes toward sexual behavior. Read the Torah. Read Leviticus. It is not easy to find Biblical proof, but if you will hunt, you will find the admonitions that relate to our efforts—and we will never be wholly successful if we separate our teaching from the great concepts of love, morality, reverence, and home. This setting has to be the backdrop against which we teach. Anything else relates only to animal behavior. A bibliography of good

religious works is as important to us as a Bowman⁷ or a McCary.⁸ Have you read Dean Robert Capon's *Dead and Board?*⁹ That is a good book on marriage in general and as important as Bowman's *Marriage for Moderns* anytime. And then there is the scholarly work of Derriek Sherwin Bailey on the *Sexual Relation in Christian Thought*.¹⁰ Such books are important background reading for anyone dealing with sex education.

The pendulum may be swinging toward a more permissive attitude toward sexual behavior. Tom Jones may yet prevail over Billy Graham, but getting rid of hypocrisy in sex does not necessarily mean freedom from restraint. Restraint, chastity, or monogamy may well be self-selected and self-imposed for good reasons, and argumentation on these points is as much a part of sex education, if not more so, as teaching about contraception. The toughest and most difficult question I ever had put to me in a class in health education was the one asked by a freshman who wanted to know whether there was a biological base for either the Christian or Jewish codes of sexual morality. He could not see his sex life in isolation from his approach to life itself and was seeking wholeness as he faced his own personal problems. I had to know something about the Christian and Jewish codes of morality to satisfy him.

3. *We need to know also that we are helping our students meet the so-called new morality.* They have problems. There is nothing new about the problems, just more of them and affecting more young people because there are more young people. As the old Down-Easterner said: he's not sure there is any more or different hanky-panky going on today than in his day, but he's just mad because there's a different crowd doing it!

Time for July 11, 1969, tells a pretty good story of what is happening on stage and in movies and the press and bookstalls of today. Surely young people will not be able to escape the continued influence of all of these forces. We must know what these forces are so as to be able to meet them. *Desire Under the Elms* set tongues wagging for years, four decades ago. Eugene O'Neill was an evil force in the estimation of many. Theda Bara was not an unexciting person on the screen, and now we have *Oh, Calcutta!* and Vanessa Redgrave and the Living Theater and *I, a Woman* and the comic innuendos of Tommy and Dick Smothers and Rowan and Martin and the " pornos." Are these signs of a civilization falling apart?

If the Supreme Court has trouble defining pornography, if censorship of entertainment is disappearing, if local groups don't know what smut is or isn't where does that leave the lively adolescent? And us? It leaves the adolescent at the point of searching for values in decision-making—about his or her own behavior. Do I or don't I? How far do I go? The outdoor movie or the overnight beach picnic or the love-in may be the proving ground. Decisions have to be

made and it is our job to help these young people make them, not by taking out of cold storage some unrelated fact about the vas deferens and its tributaries but by relating, if necessary, that choice morsel of information to the whole jigsaw puzzle of values, ideals, appetites, capabilities, hazards, and all the other components of the self-seeking solutions.

4. *We need to know that we are teaching everybody.* In this day of high mobility in our population we are likely to have everybody in any given class—the rich and the poor, the well and sick, the genetically favored and the genetically handicapped. We will have children from every religion, color, and educational background. We will have the 200,000 youngsters who come before our courts every year. We will have the half million with psychomotor irregularities. What kind of sex education will they receive?

We will have the 10 million hungry youngsters, the 7 million whose life expectancy is shortened by disease and despair. We will have the youngsters—4 million of them—who will become our problem drinkers. Does sex education have anything to do with these people? And still these mad critics want us to keep hands off sex education because it is something only for the home and church! How evasive of reality can they get?

But mainly we will have the 40 percent of all children who drop out before their 12 years of school are finished. Why do they? Because our contemporary programs of education do not motivate them to stay in school. And part of our failure is the absence of just such an area of study as we are talking about—an area that might give a little more meaning to life and cultivate a bit more of the self-respect so badly needed by these dropouts. We teach everybody—and no one sex education curriculum in the world will fit them all. We need variation in content, approach, and style to do this job right.

5. *We need to know that in developing sex education as a part of a broad program of health education, we are not only shattering an old liberal arts tradition but we are scaring some of our fellow educators to death!* I cannot resist saying once again that although our colleges and universities and thus our high schools have made heroic attempts to study man and his society, man and his environment, man and his technology, they have been very chary about studying man himself. *The Lonely Crowd* is insightful and the darling of sociology departments. Thomas Wolfe is given a thorough treatment in classes in American literature, but somehow the response to our request to deal well with cancer and nutrition or the effect of this sedentary life or to talk about sexuality is usually less than we would want. Tradition has it that we can talk of humans in relations to their world but not about humans themselves. Don't get personal—and what is more personal than sex? So we need to know that we get less support than we would hope for from our deans and principals because they

are frightened of breaking new ground—especially with such a sharp shovel as sex education.

If these are some of the things we need, what are some of the things we don't need?

1. *I am not sure we need any more animals to help us in our teaching.* Our zoo is pretty full as it is. Some very earnest writers the other day told us of the use of ducks, dogs, fish, turtles, kangaroos, and birds in teaching kindergarten children about the beginning of life. And we have made plentiful use of cows, horses, rabbits, elephants, guppies—the whole bit—in order to help the young understand what daddy does to mommy and where little sister came from.

Well, I wonder. Perhaps I was brought up in the wrong generation—the one that had Robert Benchley wondering out loud just what the advantages were of sending city kids to the farm to observe the copulation process of horses. Are farm families happier because they know these animal facts? Is the divorce rate lower? Are farm husbands more faithful? Is there less promiscuity among farm children? Less voyeurism? Fewer unwanted pregnancies? Are the ingredients of an enduring marriage to be found in the barnyard? Or the animal cage? What are the facts? Does it really help to raise animals in the classroom?

Or is this animal approach merely a stall—a way to spend some time dodging around the real and delicate issues involved in *human* relations? What does this use of zoological phenomena have to do with friendship, decency, morals, devotion, chastity, and love? Is family life education and homemaking among human beings advanced by watching the male birds bring home the provender to feed the hungry mouths of the young? I am particularly repelled by the filth in the homes of a few families of purple martins whose nest I clean out each year so that the next crowd in can soil them up in their own way!

I am not sure at all what the activities of bulls or stallions contribute to the marriage bed. I have a hunch something else is needed here. I don't think we need the animal-bird-guppy approach to sex education, and as parent and teacher, I doubt I ever will.

2. *Nor do we need an indiscriminate use of descriptions of the anatomy and physiology of human reproduction.* Discriminating use—yes. And there is only one clue to discrimination—anatomical and physiological detail is never of any avail except as it is needed to explain a problem or question or contribute to understanding of function. The chapter in the text ought not to begin with the anatomy of parts.

Anatomy and physiology without relevance to interest, curiosities, or prob-

lems are like what speed reading is to contemplative understanding of a page. They do not provide the beauty of the line or the melody of thought. Learning about the ovarian capsule or the prostate gland may or may not have any relation to a living experience. A good teacher is concerned about affecting living experience and not about the accumulation of knowledge for its own sake. Anatomy and structure are useful only as explanation of function. Modern objects know this; so do space pilots. Why don't we?

It is because many of us have developed an unwholesome and unshakable reverence for the sanctity of subject matter. Any suggestion that part of anatomy or physiology of the human body be omitted tends to be treated as heresy. The fullness of the course and its value are defended by teachers who point proudly to the tough questions that are used to test knowledge at the end of the course. Far too many of our health education courses are crammed with a superabundance of uncorrelated facts, at least in the mind of the student who takes the course.

Generally speaking, no teacher can teach and no student can absorb in one year or one semester such an overwhelming avalanche of material together with its conceptual connections. This fact, of course, does not escape perceptive teachers. They use, therefore, the inductive method which they regard as essential to the learning procedure. They seek problems and develop demonstrations, lectures, and discussions to assist students in solving these problems. They help students relate and correlate their facts and then assist them to develop a generalization or concept so that the facts are illuminated by the light of principles. This inductive method has the advantage of getting right at the problems that are real, cogent, and germane to the lives of students. The only flaw in this method is clearly seen when teachers become so busy that they are unable to take the time at the end of a sub-area in health education to develop the conceptual illumination so necessary to bring the whole thing together and build it in as a significant part of one's well-structured concept of life itself.

3. *Nor do we need evasion of these problems.* The contemporary scene must be dealt with. If a child wants to know where babies come from, he should be told accurately now, and with love, or he'll not be happy with his information when he does find it out. The stork and other pleasant evasive myths were fine in their time, but their time has passed. We just don't need people who drag their feet and resist appropriate curriculum developments.

4. *We don't need people who accuse the health educator of everything from immorality to homosexuality if he or she tries to help some student develop decision-making capabilities.* Nor do we need those who punish or ostracize or in other ways make life difficult for young ones with problems—like refusing to let girls come back to school after delivery of their baby or looking down our

snobbish academic noses if youngsters want us to tell the truth instead of evading questions. Students do not need to be sent out of the room if they use a bad word. They need to be helped to understand why the word is not in acceptable usage and the circumstances, if any, under which it is. Youngsters need an open door somewhere, a door that will lead to scientific decent counseling, but on their terms and dealing with their problems as imposed upon them by the world in which they live. We do not need teachers, principals, board members, or citizens in the community who are cowards or insensitive or unaware of today's problems wherever they are and from whatever segment of society they come.

5. Another thing we do not need, and I am sure you will all agree to this one, is poorly prepared personnel in charge of these programs. Sex education is one of those areas where several different kinds of people get involved. Sex education is not like physics or chemistry or mathematics, for which people seldom claim competency unless they have been professionally prepared. Strangely enough, almost anybody—the local barber, the businessman, the minister, the minister's wife, the butcher, the baker, or the candlestick maker can talk with seeming authority about weight control, cold remedies, or the propriety of sex education. These areas seem to be victims of enthusiastic ignorance on the part of many people. We would hope for at least a reasonable measure of competence on the part of anyone who would presume to accept some responsibility for teaching others in this area.

In the first and last analysis, parents have the key to the whole thing. There is absolutely no use for parent groups to get all stirred up for fear someone is going to usurp their prerogative in sex education. Inevitably parents have the first word, and both by word-of-mouth and by example most children are indelibly affected by what goes on at home.

Parents have such obvious responsibility that I only wish they would all accept it and equally well. From infancy on, what is learned about modesty, sex differences, family relationships, heredity, love, restraint, dress, chastity, promiscuity, morals, romance, marriage, and the whole gamut of values and facts has its origin at home. There is transmitted for the first time and from the diaper stage forward the powerful cultural values and practices that we propose in sex education to clarify, supplement, modify, or deny.

Wouldn't it be fine if all parents knew enough not to talk from their own personal experience as if those experiences were reliable criteria for the sexual life of all others? You know, mother may have had a bad experience as a girl, never improved upon it in marriage, know nothing of the ecstasy but only the agony, and thus pass on her experience to her daughter as typical. Or father may have been a virgin at marriage and so frightened still that he clams up on Junior,

who then falls victim to the local nudity cult or somehow struggles through to his own marriage feeling no concern for the element of beauty or compassion in the sex life. If somehow we could persuade everyone, particularly parents, priests, and teachers, that they have no business talking only from personal experience but must supplement that experience by reading and study of the scientific literature of the field, children would be better off. Parent groups, such as child study leagues and men's study groups, could well devote constructive programs to reading and discussion of some of the fine literature for parents now available. Personal experience alone is not enough.

In this context, one would certainly encourage the development of the so-called marriage course at the college level as well as any course at any level where sex education plays a part. Those who go to college will become informed in this area before they become parents, and they may be in a better position, therefore, to discharge their responsibilities. Otherwise, I would personally doubt the wisdom of leaving this whole area to parents and denying the school its opportunity to make its effort to dispel the massive accumulation of ignorance, folklore, fear, and fallacy that now gets in the way of some rational understanding of sex as a function of life.

Ministers? Not if all they have is Divine Revelation! Something more is needed. These people are in key spots with certain large segments of our population. They are the purveyors, the architects, of our moral values. They can influence children tremendously. Through work with adolescents they can make or break many a confused, bewildered, and searching young one. Don't underestimate their place or their influence.

But I wish they were better prepared to fulfill their correlative mission in this area. I wish the local preacher were not so ready to jump on the bandwagon in criticism of school efforts. Some of them seem to know so much! I saw one of those abusive anti-sex education booklets the other day, from New England. Only four names appeared to be backing it, and they were all ministers! Ministers all over the country are in the act of objecting to our effort, when actually they ought to know more about what we are doing and be supportive with the whole power of their office.

It is, therefore, reassuring to hear of the efforts some denominations are planning to advance the education of their ministers through workshops, institutes, and reading courses. The more of this the better. If the clergy is to participate as counselors or teachers in this area, every one of them from the bishop down to the circuit-riding preacher out in the boondocks must have solid preparation in the area. Unfortunately, divinity schools have been just like most schools of education—sublimely indifferent to the needs of their clients in this area.

As for the certified school teachers, there are so many of them who relate to sex education. Almost all of them. Can you think of any who do not? But mainly we think of classroom elementary teachers, health education teachers, physical education, science, biology, home economics teachers, and nurses. I would not know how to appraise the level of competency of all of these people in this area. All I know is that I agree with H. S. Hoyman when he says emphatically that we are not preparing enough teachers to meet the need.¹¹ Hoyman says we are highly vulnerable here, and the antis are attacking us at this weak spot. How right he is! Right now we are paying the price for 50 years of lethargy on the part of state departments of public instruction and colleges of education. Go back before World War I and to the 1920s. In those days such people as Thomas Wood and Maurice Bigelow urged strenuously the preparation of teachers not only in sex education but in health education as a whole. But the response has been somewhat less than the response mathematics and science education enjoyed after Sputnik!

What we need in 1970 to meet not just the needs of young people in sex education but in the whole field of health education is *everything*. We need, as Elena Shiepcovich pointed out in 1963, recognition and subsidy from the federal government for the preparation of teachers in health education.¹² Science teachers cannot take over all there is to be taught in health education. They are too busy with other things. So are home economics teachers. We need from Congress and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a substantial, solid, meaningful recognition of health education as a professional area in education commensurate with its value. We need thousands of teachers prepared in this area, and Congress and the Executive Branch must help. We need state departments that will develop health education as a "solid" subject and take it forever out of its ridiculous category as a "special" one. Look at the experience in New York and Connecticut and perhaps elsewhere. There the legislatures made health education mandatory, and schools in the three or whatever years of grace they have to find teachers and purposeful curriculums have been frantically but constructively meeting their anticipated situation. The federal government could help if it would. (And we are grateful to those who have been helping to get tangible recognition for health education from the government. I refer particularly to the staff of the School Health Education Study and to the staff of AAHPER and of AASA.)

But mainly we need continuous and strenuous effort at the level of the state departments of public instruction. I have always thought that there was the epicenter of our problem. There the certification standards are developed and enforced. There curriculums are recommended—some of them mandated; there credits for graduation from approved high schools are stipulated. There the alleged differences between special and solid, academic and nonacademic courses are perpetuated. There the rivalries among the various areas of learning

are intense. There health education in most places unfortunately comes off second best. Too bad. But not all is dreary. There are bright spots where our efforts have borne fruit and health education is emerging in full dignity and status. In 1970 we need a continuation of this effort. We need laws either permissive or mandatory inserting health education into every grade level to rank in importance with English and mathematics. We need teachable curriculums for local use, and we need well qualified teachers at every level.

State departments of education are crucial here, but running a close second are the sources of teachers and administrators—our college departments of education. I could write a book about our college departments of education and the people who run them. There are some excellent ones with a willingness and farseeing programs to meet needs. And then there are some, perhaps the majority, who are unmindful, stubborn, and lethargic in the face of our pleas to do something by way of preparing teachers and administrators in health education or to improve what they are already doing. The youngsters coming along in college need more than a little three-hour course to cover the whole field of health education. To handle mathematics adequately they get 15 or 20 such credits in some places. Is the binomial theory more useful or important than an understanding of adolescent love? The physical science studies sometimes draw 10 or 12 preparatory hours. Rocks on the moon more crucial a study than rocks in the head? Correspondence with Drs. Pollock and Sliepcevich of the School Health Education Study confirms the impression that there are not enough qualified health teachers to meet the need, and the most urgent need in teacher preparation is for better preparation in the general field of health education for prospective elementary and secondary teachers. Many colleges and universities do not provide teacher candidates with even a basic health course. So it is perfectly true that we have hundreds of elementary and secondary school teachers going into the field every year not knowing a thing about health education or its various components.

Furthermore, the day is rapidly passing when we can leave such a significant area as health education to the joint ministrations of an earnest student who has a major in both health education and physical education. Health education has emerged as a recognized field of its own, and it needs all the attention anybody can give it.

And by all means we need curriculum directors, principals, and superintendents with enough knowledge and perception of the significance of health education and its noisy member of the family, sex education, to present the case in legislative hearings, board meetings, before community groups, and even before their own staffs. There is no more justification for a curriculum director or school superintendent to plead innocence and ignorance about health education than to plead that way about the social studies or the physical sciences. It is

about time graduate schools of education from Harvard to Stanford opened their eyes a bit and incorporated into their rather highly developed curriculums for school administrators some consideration of the health problems of our population and what organized education can do about them.

As for the others—physicians, nurses, counselors—obviously they all have a part to play. Science can provide an understanding of life and its processes. Physicians can provide the valuable intimate counseling of patient to doctor and sometimes a good school presentation as a resource person with student and parent groups. Nurses can make the same contribution well prepared teachers can make, if the nurse is a well prepared teacher. A nurse's counseling and resource services in sex education are more valuable than a lot of people realize.

There are some other things we do not need, too. In the last analysis, I suppose we can judge the quality of teaching in this area by its accuracy—and its good taste. To many parents and to a lot of children, any public discussion of sex is offensive. We have to remember that not everywhere are we as permissive as we seem to be on Broadway, in Hollywood, or in slick print. We have thousands of schools where the children are brought up carefully and conservatively and to whom four-letter words, descriptions of the sex act, of birth, of the terminology of sex and reproduction are not well accepted. So when a university professor gets splashed all over a popular news magazine extolling the novelty of his approach to sex education by having the students name the sex organs out loud, people have every right to raise their eyebrows. Bad taste. Flamboyant. Unnecessary. We do not need to have children sent home with questionnaires inquiring into their parents' sex life. Bad taste. Let us leave that to the Kinsey Foundation and others. Nor do we need to say that to indoctrinate children with a set of rigid rules and ready-made formulas is doomed to failure. That is asking for trouble unnecessarily. We do not need the four-letter words in class, even though there are some of us who argue for the use of the idiom as a way to foster good teaching. As of now, the use of four-letter words is still poor taste. We do not need some of the starkly realistic documentaries we show to all our students. We do not need teachers to assign drawing or modeling of genitals. We do not need graphic descriptions of copulation. We should remember that in the schoolroom we cannot do it all—that students do have family, friends, and many have ministers and physicians who can help to educate them. We can be a little more conservative—not quite so enthusiastic—and still perform our function very well indeed.

6. *We do not need inaccuracy, guesswork, folklore, superstition, or ignorance.* Teachers who do not know an IUD from the pill and never heard of silastic had better back away from the contraception problem until they catch up on their reading. And if criteria for masculinity or wise remarks about frigidity generate from the locker room, we know we have some pretty inaccurate and dangerous stuff. Let's be accurate—or let's skip the whole thing.

We must all understand, nevertheless, that the insistence on accuracy may be a part of our problem. So much of the scientific aspects of our sex life is mixed up with Christian and Judaic beliefs and the cultural patterns of tribal origin that one who tries to bring science into the story may become a fit target for those whose beliefs have been outraged. Furthermore, the scientists themselves, whether physiologists, psychologists, endocrinologists, or any other kind of organic scientist, probably know how far away they are from "accuracy" in describing sexual function. Just try to do a scientific and accurate job on homosexuality in the classroom! In the first place, not enough is known about it scientifically to do a convincing job on it, and in the second place, philosophers, religionists, scientists, and writers for 2,500 years have been quarreling as to whether homosexuality is normal. In fact, the plot gets thicker when you realize that there is no definitive agreement as to whether humans are naturally heterosexual, bisexual, or homosexual! In our culture, we make it clear that only heterosexuality is acceptable, but is this cultural or physiological? Nobody knows—for sure.

7. *We do not need continued fragmentation of the curriculum into little sub-areas relating to health.* Sex education and family living is one of these. It sticks out like a sore thumb when introduced into the curriculum as something separate and apart from the rest. It becomes a convenient target for those who do not understand what we are trying to do in the total field of school health instruction. We do not need a separate treatment for sex education at the elementary or secondary levels any more than we need a semester of environmental health, or physiology of the human body, or dental health, or mental health, or drug abuse. Such segmentation is a remnant of a past approach. To offer these subjects as separate credit units actually interferes with the development of a full-bodied curriculum in health education as represented by our modern courses of study. Once we can develop these complete and graded curriculums, all of these neat sub-areas will meld into an intelligent approach to the study of human beings as a whole.

Some day we will see the light. Dawn will break and bathe our curriculum makers in health education or physical education and other life sciences with the truth of a person's unity and integrated nature. And we will develop our courses of study not around these structural segments of a person's life but around the person's various constellations of problems. We will all stop talking about body and mind as if they were separate things. We will end this stupidity about physical health and mental health. Physical educators will see the educational as well as the developmental aspects of their field. The body beautiful may still be beautiful but only as a byproduct and not as the end of their efforts. Health educators will stop this prattle about health as an end and see their efforts as leading to development and improvement of self as an expendable tool toward the achievement of one's purposes.

Finally, we need community involvement. Despite the unpleasant experiences of some 50 or more communities that have come under the fire of the organized opposition to sex education, I believe San Diego and Anaheim and Bexley and hundreds of other places have been right. We do need community involvement in this area, and we do not need unilateral development. Communities could well start where Illinois started, with formation of a statewide sex education advisory board, advisory to the office of the state superintendent of public instruction. They have approached this area constructively and produced "A Policy Statement and Suggested Steps Toward Implementing Family Life and Sex Education Programs" and other literature helpful to the public and to school people alike. Communities might do what San Diego did years ago, as reported in the *Journal of School Health* in 1959 and 1961 by G. G. Wetherill.¹³ There a year or more was spent in advance of the introduction of units on sex education in the health education program to cultivate the interest of parents and secure not only their approval but, more important, their understanding.

To tell the story of intent to adult groups capable of serious thought in school matters does two things: it aids the adults in the broadening of their understanding about the needs of their children, and it frequently gives the school people a broader understanding of the needs of children and how to meet them. (We found that out years ago in the Ohio study when hundreds of parents were involved in pointing out to us the crucial areas of need in health education.) Those who go it alone in the development of programs are asking, if not for trouble, at least for misunderstanding.

But who could have predicted this rash, this epidemic of volatile criticism? Did the Birch Society or Drake or Hargis or Marrow run out of things to attack now that we have the "new leadership in the White House"? How can we explain the vitriol, the damaging personal attacks on Mary Calderone and others of the SIECUS organization? How does one get at the dynamics of the efforts of these local crusaders who are so convinced of the holy rightness of their position? I asked these questions of some friends, and among the many helpful answers I received was this one from Dr. Marion Pollock: "Sex is always news. It's ironic to see the current absorption of the public with explicitly depicted nudity, perversity, sex acts of one kind or another in films and on the stage, in the literature, on television, advertising, at the same time the public is reeling back in horror at the news that sex education is being taught in the schools. Sadly, I believe it is because adults do not know what sex education is, so they interpret it in terms of their own experience. We live in a society in which, willingly or not, we are voyeurs. Yet in the midst of it, there is this clamor by certain groups to protect children from the 'filth' which they preceive education about sex to be! 'Would you want your 8-year-old daughter to hear such filth as "reproduction" and "uterus"?' asked one indignant

mother! Are we moving too fast, too far, or are we okay? I guess it depends on who 'we' are, and who is looking at 'us'."

I found a 10-year-old publication on "Psychodynamics of Group Opposition to Health Programs" helpful.¹⁴ This one warned me not to assume that all our violent opponents of the day are crackpots or malevolent or ignorant. Some of their followers may be misled, but they are not all stupid. These people must be met on their own terms and brought around not by tactics similar to theirs but by explanation, demonstration, and discussion. It seems so easy for those misdirected people to pick on the schools—just when schools need breathing space to solidify gains in instructional theory and practice and adjust to the population explosion.

But again, it has always been that way. Instead of taking on other social or commercial institutions that may have something to do with the development of children, these strange people find teachers easy to pick on and, for the most part, too professional or too frightened or too something to fight back. These secondrels are afraid our efforts in sex education are demoralizing our youth. Are we responsible for the high crime rate in our cities? For the higher divorce rate, too? For racial tensions? For automobile accidents? For drug abuse? Where do the examples of cruelty, avarice, violence, dishonesty, prejudice, and inhumanity come from? Do these destructive leaders of this destructive anti-sex education movement ever wonder? They seem afraid to tackle what might be a militant adversary from the world of private enterprise, or they would direct the fire of their anger on others. Who are the more influential teachers—Vanessa Redgrave and Mia Farrow, or Miss Snodgrass in the 7th grade? Don't be ridiculous, Dr. Drake and Mr. Hargis! Why not earn your living elsewhere where you can pan some real gold?

The tempest, violent though it is, will blow over, leaving scars and some dead bodies, leaving some silly laws on the books that will have to be repealed or circumvented (remember the laws about evolution?). The kids will suffer—being denied access to good materials—but they will survive to pass along the misconceptions and irrelevancies they have picked up in place of the good stuff they might have learned in school.

In conclusion, let me try to alleviate the fears of some about sex education in schools. There is no war on, no diabolical plot to undermine the teachings of Christianity or Judaism or Mohammedanism or anything else. True, there may be capricious sensationalists among our teachers who, turned loose in this area, may make asses of themselves and titillate and disturb their charges. But these are so few in number compared to the rest of us who seek only to substitute enlightenment for bewilderment and ignorance and to provide substance to be used in the decision-making process so prominent in our lives from 8 to 80. To

be sure, there are a few teachers who, by virtue of their perverse personalities, know nothing of love or reverence or morality and thus barge into this area to create chaos and criticism. Furthermore, it will be necessary to remember how slowly the public receives any new and threatening ideas—ideas that threaten established and traditional concepts, particularly those that have a close relationship to church or state. Galileo felt the scorn of the Church and suffered the tortures of the Inquisition. Closer to our interests, perhaps, are the struggles of Harvey, Jenner, Semmelweiss, and Pasteur as they attempted to introduce new ideas or change our ways of thinking concerning biological states. The idea of the smallpox vaccination as first set forth by Jenner took almost a hundred years to take hold in this country, and Semmelweiss' concern about contamination took almost as long.

So here we are again. Frankness, truth, revelation in the areas of sex education meet with a public uproar from those who fear the destruction of their comfortable ways of living. So they conjure up the specter of Communism or any other wolf in sheep's clothing to persecute, embarrass, or degrade those who would enlighten. We must remember that so much of man remains in the realm of the unknown. We know so little about him. That is why we have these resurgencies of mysticism—of critical attitudes—as seeming reactions against modern science. But it would be a great error for all of us if we assumed that the phenomenon of sex about which we purport to educate can be reduced to an exact science and the ethics surrounding its use computerized. If ethics and morals could be programed in human beings we would be in a lot less trouble than we are, but so far we have been able only to destroy man—not to create him. Man's problem thus, as I interpret Langdon Gilkey, is not just to enlighten his mind or develop a will to control his instinctive machine, but to be seen as a totality, a unified being made of body and of instincts; of conscious and subconscious, of intelligence and will, all in baffling and complex interaction.¹⁵ And it is that total psychophysical organism, that total existing self in its unity, that determines whether the higher powers of mind and of will are going to be used creatively or destructively. Thus, a person's health or unhealth depends primarily on the fundamental character, direction, and loyalty of oneself as a whole, involving the deepest level of his being where his spiritual unity is achieved.

NOTES

1. Lillian Hellman, "An Unfinished Woman: A Memoir," *Saturday Review*, July 5, 1969, p. 30.
2. "Health Education: A Conceptual Approach to Curriculum Design," *The School Health Education Study*, Elena M. Shiepcovich, director (St. Paul, MN: 3M Educational Press, 1969).
3. "Growth Patterns and Sex Education," *The Journal of School Health* 37, no. 5a, May 1967.
4. Sex Information and Education Council of the United States, Publication Office, 1825 Willow Road, Northfield, IL 60093.

5. Helen Manley, *A Curriculum Guide in Sex Education* (St. Louis: State Publishing Co., 1964).
6. Esther D. Schulz and Sally R. Williams, *Family Life and Sex Education Curriculum and Instruction* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969).
7. Henry A. Bowman, *Marriage for Moderns*, 5th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965).
8. James Leslie McCary, *Human Sexuality* (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1967).
9. Robert Capon, *Dead and Board* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1965).
10. Derriek Sherwin Bailey, *Sexual Relation in Christian Thought* (New York: Harper Bros., 1959).
11. H. S. Hoyman, "Where Are We Now in Sex Education---An Appraisal," Mimeographed, University of Illinois-Urbana, 1969.
12. Elena M. Sliepeeveh, "Should Health Be Interested in School and College Health Programs?" *Journal of School Health* 33, no. 4, April 1963, p. 145.
13. G. G. Wetherill, "Who Is Responsible for Sex Education," *Journal of School Health* 29, no. 10, Dec. 1959, p. 361; and "Sex Education in the Public Schools," *Journal of School Health* 31, no. 7, Sept. 1961, p. 235.
14. Judd Marmor, Viola W. Bernard and Perry Ottenberg, "Psychodynamics of Group Opposition to Health Programs," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 30, no. 2, April 1960.
15. Langdon Gilkey, *Shantung Compound* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 115.

An Appraisal of Health Education in the Space Age

To appraise health education in the space age gives one the opportunity to look at many facets of the field. I have chosen to examine three of them to discover, if we can, meaning, implication, or direction. Let us look, first, at the advancement of science and what it means to health education; second, at the relation of health education to liberal and general education; and third, at curriculum problems involved in the development of health instruction in schools.

The recent Parliament of Science held in March 1958 in Washington, D.C., under the auspices of the American Association for the Advancement of Science concluded that the power of man through science is currently assuming a new order of magnitude. How to use this knowledge and this power and what it means for the benefit of mankind confronts us now as the most challenging question of the day.

We are just beginning to see that these advances, tremendous as they are, constitute the signal, rather than the nucleus of the atom. Science is entering a new and accelerated stage of advancement, which will give to humanity the possibility of control over our environment, over ourselves, and over our destiny. With prospects that are both marvelous and frightening, we are on the threshold of a revolutionary probing of the cell and of the mind.¹

Delivered at the joint meeting of the American School Health Association and the School Health and Public Health Education Sections of the American Public Health Association, at the annual meetings in St. Louis, October 28, 1958.

There is reason to believe, reports the Parliament, that the changes we are now seeing, along with those to come, will make the Industrial Revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries seem relatively insignificant in its bearing upon human welfare. A few examples may suffice. Researchers in biophysics, like those in biochemistry, may come up with important new facts regarding such diverse matters as metabolism, the pairing of genes, or the effect of atomic radiation upon longevity. By-products of fissionable materials are being used in the control of cancer. A new polio vaccine may not merely control polio but wipe the virus from the face of the earth. Remarkable advances in the science of anesthesia enable surgeons to attempt and succeed with operations undreamed of 20 years ago. The effects upon people of altitude, speed, and sound are being thoroughly studied. In recent years we have profited from the development of the sulfa drugs, antibiotics, the sterol derivatives, and drugs for mental diseases. The psychologist is teaming with the psychiatrist to get at the causes of irrational behavior and thus possibly to make great strides in reducing mental disturbance.

The impact of automation and its implications for leisure will not be denied as a health problem. New knowledge about heart disease, nutrition, dental caries, old age, and virtually every other aspect of human existence is yielding perhaps a secret a day to the probing, insatiable investigator.

Perhaps among the most fascinating and important of the problems that will yield to study and research will be those in the area of mental health and social behavior. Surely the massive nature of these problems as they exist today offer a splendid target for both the teacher and the researcher. Not only are millions of persons beset with problems of anxiety, fear, boredom, and lack of orientation, but we have not yet found ways to create a healthy social climate. Perhaps we will see the social anthropologist, the biologist, the psychiatrist, and surely others combine their talents to reveal the causes and nature of interracial and international unrest. We may soon learn something of the pathology of prejudice and treat as ill those who find themselves constitutionally or prejudicially unable to accept the human race as it is. The cooperative efforts of our scientists of the future will, I venture to say, reveal a great deal about the kind of mentality that permits crushing humiliation to be vested by one person upon another. World problems of population control, pandemics, food distribution, sanitation, and the abolition of feelings of racial superiority and social bigotry herald, with their very pressing presence, the space age.

The health educator must be aware of these problems so that he or she can lead others to recognize them and, beyond that, to understand the causes of the behavior that create the problem. Somehow the world must be taught to face a set of realities involving the affairs and destiny of humanity.

But supposing we health educators knew all about these problems. What would we do with it all? As the farmer said when encouraged to seek some advanced training, "Shucks, I ain't using but half what I know now." It seems clear that the general public is about in that situation. The public is putting to use much less of the available scientific information than it should.

If we are to make full and good use of this information, we educators must improve our techniques not only of familiarizing ourselves with the substance of this advance, particularly in the life sciences, but perhaps even more important, we must vastly improve our skills of communication with the student and general public in an effort to achieve greater acceptance on their part of the material we are making available to them.

But first the health educator, both school and public, must possess the information. It comes at us from every side. Pick up *The Journal of School Health*, *The American Journal of Public Health*, *Science*—any half dozen other good publications in the life sciences—and one can read indefinitely about these modern developments. Furthermore, there must be more than a thousand books a year published in this country alone on subjects related to human health. Information is available everywhere, and if ever a group of people need to work together to share this information, we in health education do. This is no time for jurisdictional disputes or coy snobbishness about who is better prepared to do the job. Everyone had better be well prepared, and everyone had better help everyone else meet the demands of the situation. From the classroom teacher in the second grade in a small village to the well equipped science teacher in our best metropolitan high schools, from the itinerant consultant in a state department of health to the scriptwriters in public relations departments, from the physical education teacher who teaches the "health course" one hour a week to the imposing college professor with his closed-circuit television—all of these need resources, help, assistance, from any and all quarters where decent aid may be obtained. This means the voluntary agencies must get into the classroom with their educational material. It means the state departments of health and state departments of education must give thought to action through planning committees or other devices. It means the beautiful materials such as published by the National Health Education Committee should reach at least every college teacher of health education in the land and thousands of others also. It means our associations (like these meeting here today) must redouble their efforts to bring substantial stuff to the working personnel in health education who are in need. It means that if the government will spend \$2 million, or whatever, for the improvement of the teaching of physics, it should spend \$5 million on a similar project in health education.

The Status of Health Education. Right now we are going through a period of sober re-examination of the purposes and content of the curriculum from the

first grade through college. The professional educator has received an avalanche of advice from commissions, foundations, statesmen, admirals, and scientists as well as generous advice from the man in the street who writes an occasional letter to the editor. Some good will come of it. In the meantime, where does health education stand in and through all this? How do we appraise our position? Will the health education of the general student be thought of as vocationally oriented only and thus denied to the brilliant student who achieves a liberal or general education? Or will a knowledge and understanding of human life and how it is lived be considered valuable to the liberal culture of an educated person?

At the moment, and at the college level at least, we seem to prize liberal education over specialized or vocational education. We seem to believe our leadership of the future will come from those men and women who have been carefully nurtured in the liberal tradition. For the others we will seek and get a general education composed of a minimal cultural background in science, language, the arts, and the social studies.

Let us examine the purposes of liberal patterns of education. One source holds that a liberal education seeks to develop a cultivated elite in our population. Another wants to prepare students to "play a fruitful role in our social and political life," another to teach the college student "how to think," or "to acquaint him with the great ideas of civilization." To help the student become a person of breadth and discrimination and to give the person inner resources of strength and stability so to guide effectively his or her own life is a laudable aim. Describe it any way you wish—make a "liberal" education central or incidental to your plans for the reconstruction of education—and I believe you will find that health education, being germane to life itself and its living, will be and is as foundational as language and as necessary to survival of the race, I daresay, as physics or chemistry. Can you imagine anyone "playing a fruitful role in our society" who is beset with the aberrations of a sick mind—made sick because of an inability to solve his or her own problems? Can you imagine the loss of valuable manpower from preventable disease? Can anyone be called a skillful thinker who knows so little of human nature as to squander his or her strength and talent in irrational living? How can one expect our statesmen or our politicians or anyone else for that matter to solve other people's problems or to guide their own lives without knowing something about the life they have to guide?

Health education can be thought of as nothing else than *central* to liberal or general education. Properly put together, health education represents a synthesis of the best of the sciences and the arts as this best bears upon human health, survival, and welfare. Properly developed, it takes pertinent material from the biologies, from medicine and kindred fields, from psychology, and

from the social studies and makes from these contributions a study aimed at improving the quality of human life.

But health education is not yet what the traditional scholar thinking in traditional ways recognizes as a "discipline." It does not stand among scholarly fields as something uniquely contributory to this world's knowledge. It has no unique areas of investigation, no unique methodology, not even a characteristic philosophy to guide its application. This is not to say it cannot or will not have these qualities. It is merely to say that as of now, the beginning of the space age, health education does not have the traditional earmarks of an academic discipline. Whether advancing knowledge in the science of personality, further study of the relation of the psyche to the soma, and kindred frontier investigations will aid the recognition of health education as a field of knowledge remains to be seen. Perhaps additional knowledge on the nature of creativity in relation to fulfillment of man's purposes will help the cause.

But until then health education probably will not be considered an "academic" subject. It is, as I have said, a synthesis of many fields brought together for utilitarian, pragmatic purposes. As such it will probably remain handicapped in the competitive race for a place in the curriculum. Worse yet, we have seen in the post-Sputnik panic many of the "special" subjects like health education, home economics, and industrial arts ridiculed as being unimportant. Life-adjustment courses, meaning principally health education, were particularly held up to scorn.

It will all shake down, and I venture to predict that when it does health education will have a central place in the education of young people, whether they are pursuing a liberal education or a vocational one. It will, provided we in health education improve our ways of presenting the material.

J. S. Haldane once said: "All true knowledge must be a gradual revelation of the lower or more abstract in terms of the higher or more concrete aspects of reality; and as the conception of organism is a higher and more concrete conception of matter and energy science must ultimately aim at gradually interpreting the physical world of matter and energy in terms of the biological conception of organism."² Does this mean that health education, being one form of biological interpretation of organism, can do nothing else in the long run than grow in stature and importance? I believe so. It may, to be sure, lose its identity as such; but it will, if science grows and if Haldane is right, eventually become the framework in which we shall understand the physical world of matter and energy.

Problems of Curriculum. How can the curriculum in health education be improved to meet the needs of the space age? I would like to suggest three ways:

First, we could vastly improve the effectiveness of the relation between the health educator and the students. There is far too much wordage in teaching. Too many words, far too little action. Why are so many people under 40 unvaccinated against polio when they know better? They have been told the facts of life! Why are so many people eating themselves into poor health? They know better too. Why do people not act more promptly in the face of illness that is preventable through an early diagnosis?

In our teacher preparation curriculums, wherever health educators are prepared, we have to step up considerably our study of motivation. We shall have to learn a great deal more about the learning process than we know now. We shall have to find ways of moving more surely from knowledge to action in the field of healthful living. Nell McKeever and Mayhew Derryberry mapped out five areas we should know much more about in this connection, in order to make our health education more useful.³ They effectually sum up the needs in this realm:

1. The individual's behavior, beliefs, motivations, goals, and ways of carrying these out.
2. The individual's attitudes and past experiences that facilitate progress or create barriers to change.
3. The group's goals, traditions, beliefs, practices, values, and cultures.
4. The leadership-followership patterns established by the people.
5. The objective advisability of change and the individual's or group's acceptance of change.

Second, we need to re-examine all existing courses and curriculums now offered to the general student for purposes of placing the material in more appropriate grade levels. Such a re-examination will also turn up considerable material that can be removed from health courses entirely. I have the feeling, as I look at dozens of courses of study and textbooks each year, that we are gearing our material too low for the student. We are boring students. We are not challenging them. We teach them things about nutrition in the seventh grade they could well handle in the fifth and once handled they do not want to hear about it again, particularly in their college health course. We dodge important matters like the study of medical care or of sex education because they are so "controversial" and leave in such pap as how to care for the fingernails or how to blow the nose. We need to let some things alone, dig out the really important substance of health education, and teach it where it will challenge these young people to some real thinking and studying. Is there a high school or college course taught anywhere that contains a well developed unit on racial similarities and differences as a foundation for a discussion of the pathology of prejudice? Are college health classes investigating radiation fallout as a phase for thoughtful consideration of our position vis-a-vis the continuance of atomic testing?

Would a college class or an upper division high school group find profit in analyzing the implications of the geophysical year for improvement in human health? Would the reading of Norman Cousins' editorial "Our Casual Approach to Violence," in the August 31, 1957, *Saturday Review*—written, to be sure, with reference to the international situation—serve as a stimulus to a discussion of our personal relations to each other? If it is true that the biggest problems of the future will involve teaching people to live together and eradicate the heritage of hatred from past aggression, then no one- or two-hour periods on mental health will do the job!

Perhaps the college will give back to the secondary school much of the material now taught about eating habits, prevention of disease, and "how to choose a dentist" and concentrate its precious time on a more adult type of productive and exciting experience suitable to the alert college student of today. Perhaps those problems will center mostly on the areas of mental health, social and family life, new implications of science for health, problems of population, and how to be balanced though brilliant!

The curriculum all the way up and down needs enriching. It would profit from joint planning and a form of joint participation where the contributing scientists pool their resources and come up with a solid time-consuming course (none of these one-hour-a-week horrors will do in the space age). We should expect our health courses to represent a synthesis of the best from all contributing fields as it applies to the health of humans.

But am I suggesting only an extension of the tradition of horizontal development of any curriculum, so that health education becomes still another subject to be "taken" in the course of one's educational experience? Not exclusively so. As long as a curriculum at any level remains segmented into subjects based on distinctions among bodies of knowledge, then I suppose we would do well to continue our efforts in the space age to cultivate health education as the study of the science of living healthfully into a discipline by itself with all the accoutrements of time, credit, and professional personnel. The separate "course" in health education can well stand for greater and more productive refinement as a learning experience on its own feet and command respect as something worthwhile. This will be an honorable effort as long as we deal with education in such horizontal segmentation.

But the space age, whatever its other characteristics may be, will be an age marked by integration. This concept, no matter what abuse it may be taking now from those who ridicule educational "jargon," remains the most promising pattern for the education of the future because it represents the essence of all that humanity is. One could hardly be expected to learn much about an integrated organism unless one knew something of the nature of integration and

approached the study of humans and their processes of living by learning of their integrative experiences.

It may be, therefore, that health education in the space age may center more and more around our larger problems of economic, social, and organic survival. We may study the details of our "physical" life in relation quite properly to our wants, goals, and ambitions. We may seek to understand our diseases and degenerations in terms not merely of invasions of our tissues but also by knowing something of our frustrations.

The fact of a person's integrative nature and integrating development, the fact of a person's natural struggle against disintegration have already given the educator grounds for the acceptance in principle of integrated curriculums. We have not as yet found the easily applied practical answer in terms of curriculum reform, but we'll get it. The fact of human nature will force us to get that answer.

Right now we can only surmise that the integrating influence will be felt in health education in any of these three ways: (a) we shall present either integrated or integrative studies of health problems affecting human life within the compartmentalized health education course itself; (b) we shall seek to enrich currently used integrating experiences now developed in core curriculums; and (c) we shall aid teachers in traditionally subject-centered curriculums to explore with their students the meaning of their subject matter in terms of life as it can be lived productively and healthfully as a result of the study of their subject. We may even go so far in this third pattern as to encourage the complete fusion of health education with science, as for example, into a "health-science" course.

No one should allow the current to-do urging the return to the "tough" compartmentalized courses loaded with memory work, lectures, quizzes, and the regurgitation of knowledge to be taken too seriously. People in education are generally smarter than to believe that those "good old-fashioned methods" and curriculum arrangements are the best way to educate youth. We shall get further with our objectives if we keep moving forward with our curriculum developments.

And thus we present an appraisal. Health education will, I hope, have a significant role to play in the space age. It will if it succeeds in distilling from all the sciences their substance that is most potent for human life. If Glenn Seaborg will allow me to paraphrase him, I would say we must recognize that a basic knowledge of health is fundamental to good citizenship and effective participation in today's society. We hold to the view that a liberal education is the best preparation for a life of significant achievement and service and that no education can be considered liberal that does not include health education as an integral part."⁴

Somehow health education properly and enthusiastically conceived and taught cannot help but aid man, in the words of Fillmore Sanford, "to rise to his own best level of energy and vigor, of spontaneity, of creativity, of enjoyment." ⁵ This could well be the goal of health education in the space age.

NOTES

1. "1958 Parliament of Science," *Science* 127, no. 3303, April 18, 1958, p. 852.
2. J. S. Haldane, *Mechanism, Life and Personality* (New York: Dutton, 1914), p. 98.
3. Nell McKeever and Mayhew Derryberry, "What Does the Changing Picture in Public Health Mean to Health Education in Programs and Practices?," *The American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health* 46, no. 1, Jan. 1956, p. 54.
4. Glenn T. Seaborg, "Education in Our Age: Let's Define the Problem," *California Schools* 29, no. 6, June 1958, p. 340.
5. Fillmore H. Sanford, "Creative Health and the Principle of Habeas Mentem," *American Journal of Public Health* 46, no. 2, Feb. 1956, p. 139.

Health Instruction

We are here using the term health *instruction*, rather than the term health *education*, in order to indicate that we are talking about the organized instructional work that goes on in the classroom or laboratory. We distinguish health instruction from health education, because we believe that any activity conducted in the school—from the processes of sanitary engineering and immunology to instruction in the classroom—provides health education to the children. The visit to the physician or the dentist, the ventilation of the school room, the visual problems, matters of disease prevention, experiences in the cafeteria, all add up to and contribute to the health education of the participants. By health instruction, we are referring to the lessons or laboratory experiences learned in the classroom under the guidance of a prepared and, we hope, experienced teacher.

There are those, of course, who wonder just why health instruction needs to be offered as a special course by itself. Students actually do learn a great deal about health from courses in the various sciences, home economics, physical education, even history and literature. There is probably no course offered in the curriculum that does not contribute something to learning about health. It is difficult to teach anything without health implications. This, of course, is because health itself, being a study of living, ramifies through virtually every aspect of an elementary or secondary school curriculum.

To offer a specific and direct approach to a study of health, however,

produces results far in excess of those dependent upon the process of correlation with other subjects. There are very good reasons why any school, from elementary through secondary school and into college, should offer opportunities for direct instruction in health, as follows:

1. Because 75 percent of our students terminate their education at the end of their secondary school experience and thus bring to an end any contact they might have with the scientific world relating to personal or public health—except as they may pick it up from their readings and study as adults in continuing education programs.
2. Because there is far too much going on in disease prevention and treatment, in child protection, in surgery, and in other forms of interesting scientific development to let the students rely on lesser sources.
3. Because the American public has a very poor understanding of health and health is a public affair. Thus, some study of its personal and public implications are necessary to and desirable for a literate and understanding population.
4. Because the American public spends billions on quacks, false leads, false hopes, and disappointments, and early education will protect them against much of that.
5. Because there are some half million or more new cases of psychological disturbance in our population every year. It is estimated, for example, that one out of every 20 thirteen-year-old school children need some kind of psychological or emotional guidance, without which they may develop more serious psychoses and become personal problems to the family or the community.
6. Because there are still too many broken homes and unhappy marriages, many of which might be prevented with more appropriate kinds of health instruction.
7. Because there is still far too much unnecessary maternal mortality each year, and some half a million babies still die in the first year of their lives—many of them needlessly because mothers are uninformed about early childhood care.
8. Because there are still far too many babies born with congenital syphilis, too many deaths from whooping cough, far too many instances of rheumatic heart disease, and far too many tuberculous school children—much of which could be prevented with a better kind of health instruction given to the prospective parent.

9. Because there is important information in the fields of nutrition, family life, recreation, sanitation, and various other frontiers of health instruction, which need to be brought to the attention of students of any age.

It is not too difficult to develop a set of clear-cut objectives of school health instruction, which we suggest as follows:

1. To secure behavior (action, conduct, habits) favorable to a high quality of living, and to point the way to those acts that, if performed, will assure this high quality.

2. To assist in the development of a well integrated personality, enjoying life with no reliance upon false superiorities or inferiorities but with a stability rooted in a capacity for accurate self-appraisal.

3. To clarify thinking about personal and public health matters; to remove the superstitions, the false beliefs, the ignorance; and to substitute the accuracy of science, where available, for the darkness of falsehood and misbelief.

4. To facilitate the development of security against the threats and destructive forces of the world through the acquisition of scientific knowledge, the formation of scientific attitudes, and the practice of scientific behavior.

5. To enrich the life of the community and commonwealth through the collective action of individuals well taught in the advantages of health measures to be taken for the common good.

6. To establish the ability in students to see cause and effect, to recognize consequences, and thus to preserve life and the fullness of it.

To affect favorably the personal life of an individual is the ultimate goal not only of health teaching but of all public health work. Surely all health teaching must be focused directly on the impact it makes *upon a given person*. The favorable changes that may be made in a person's life are the changes that count. Whenever one sees a table showing, for example, that 1,000 mothers die for every 100,000 births one must recognize that each of these thousand was an individual. Nothing could be effective in saving their lives except as it touched each one of them. If instruction could have done it in some cases, then it had to be instruction that was acceptable and used by that woman. Sanitary engineers have improved the public health by cleaning up the water supply and thus protecting individuals against typhoid fever. No health teacher ever spoke for an hour to 500 people and did any good whatever except insofar as the people themselves individually lived by the advice given. "The public health" is but the sum of the individual "healths" of the people who make up the public."

Thus, *all health teaching must be directed at persons*. No impersonal general approach will be as effective.

Such teaching, therefore, must be based upon, must be related to, must in fact be identical with the needs and interests of consuming learners. People of all ages have needs and interests. Sometimes they are articulate about them, sometimes not. Sometimes students readily reveal their interests. Sometimes they hide them. The teacher of health instruction must have the ability to dig them out wherever they are, to organize them for class purposes, and to use them as the material with which the class deals. (We shall discuss later how these interests may be discovered.) We can hope for a greater acceptance of health information if it relates to the problems of students than if it is arbitrarily selected and unrelated to these real problems.

On what grounds can we justify the satisfaction of personal needs in health teaching? Three general statements may be made to support this view:

1. People will not think vitally about a subject unless the subject is vital to them. The material selected to go into a course in health ought to be material that is an intrinsic part of the life of the learners. W. H. Kilpatrick once said that learners must see and feel the utility and pertinence of what is being learned as a matter of present concern to them. Only thus will they intelligently join in the movement or apply the knowledge to an actual situation. The closer the conscious relationship, the better the learning.

In view of these statements, then, the best way to get students to think vitally about their health problems would be to seek out those problems of living that are vital to them. Their interests and felt needs play just such a role.

2. Learning, for the most part, is highly specific. Students do not, as a general rule, first learn generalities and then make their applications. Learning about a particular thing takes place by specific experiences with each particular subject.

There are very good reasons to question the desirability of teaching generalizations or abstractions first. To know that digestion is principally an acid reaction or that there is phosphorus in bone may be interesting factual material to the physiologist or the anatomist, but to the ordinary consumer—the student who merely wants help in solving his or her problems of living—these are not relevant facts until they can be shown in relation to the known problem. They remain unrelated generalizations until their bearing upon some specific matter calls them up.

The idea that a person has of an abstract matter is dependent upon the sort of

situations in which that matter has been previously experienced. Symonds makes this apparent when he says, "A misconception that is found throughout all education is that learning proceeds from the general to the particular. . . . Conduct begins by the formation of separate skills and habits. . . . It is a curious anomaly that we take the end result in our own learning and try to make it the beginning in the learning of children." In other words, the generalizations we make about health, such as "the mouth is an avenue of entrance of disease," or "exercise is beneficial to health," are conclusions not readily apparent at first except by persons with trained minds or by those with an exceptionally high degree of intelligence. The generalizations or logical arrangements of experiences are continuous with, but represent the later stages of, the learning process and should not be used as points of departure.

Students have traditionally been taught to understand the best health practices only after they have studied the anatomy and physiology involved. Thus, to understand the importance of the balanced diet, they have had first to know of enzymes, amino acids, calorimeters, and nitrogen equilibrium. In order to understand how to develop a wholesome adjustment to life, they have approached the problem through the Fissures of Rolando, the centers in the medulla, or the cortical areas.

The wealth of material in human anatomy, physiology, bacteriology, and the other great sciences that have revealed the workings of human life is teachable in explanation of a human problem. The material is largely wasted when given as new material and merely to teach the student the structure and function of the body. *It may even be said that there is none at all in teaching the structure and function of the body unless the learner can use the material to further his or her development and solve his or her problems.* It is the problems and the development that offer the point of approach for the science. Otherwise the science may become wasted because, being unrelated to anything going on in the life of the learner, it is dry and dull.

3. Interests manifested by questions or outspoken curiosity represent the individual's attempts to maintain a favorable relationship with his or her environment. We may call these articulate interests. They are revealed to the teacher by the spoken word in the form of questions arising out of some situation in which learning is taking place and in which the need for a new adjustment to environment has appeared.

Raup has described this as a constant effort on the part of the human being to maintain a state of favorable adjustment with his or her world. Raup's contentions are based upon the universality of the characteristic of living things continually to be seeking a balance, or a "complacency," between themselves and their environment.

Thus, daily problems of living present the most favorable media for effective learning about health. It is within those experiences that one seeks the answers rather than have the answers to problems thrust upon oneself. A learning experience has the elements within it of the ongoing activity, the hindrance, the search for promising ways to overcome the hindrance, the application or trial of the ways, and the resumption of the activity or the solution of the problem.

Our problems are so numerous that they are not, of course, all of the same simplicity. Some are very complex, and to solve them requires learning in many areas of living. One learns of marriage, for example, not by studying some of the rudimentary phenomena of sex life but by delving far into the factors that make for successful marriage. The economic, the psychological, and the social factors are all important. When they are taught, they are better learned if the relation to the personal problems of marriage is apparent. Thus material is intrinsic when it deals with or helps solve a problem and its relation to the problem is seen. It is extrinsic when it is learned merely for its own sake and without reference to any ongoing activity or problem in the life of the learner. The material intrinsic to the solution of a problem has the better chance of being learned effectively.

But where and how can a teacher discover the interests and needs of students?

So far some 12 sources of student needs and interests have been tapped by those who seek to discover them, as follows:

1. Student questions. Given a fair and honest chance to ask questions, students will ask them in abundance. The questions, for the most part, are reliable indications of need. They are, in fact, needs themselves.
2. Parental testimony. Parents can, if they will, throw considerable light on important problems suitable for class discussion.
3. The opinions of experts. Similiar in value to parental testimony would be the opinions and observations of experts in child life or health education. Teachers, counselors, physicians, nurses, and others close to children or to families are excellent sources of student health problems.
4. Morbidity statistics. What is the nature of the illnesses of the age group being taught? From what diseases do they suffer? What are the principal causes of their illness? Such information locally for the age groups being taught would make the morbidities a fit subject for classroom discussion.
5. Mortality. Similarly, a study of the death rates for any age will reveal opportunities for education concerning the causes.

6. Analyses of school life. School life itself produces health problems. There is no reason to believe that "going to school" is altogether a healthy experience. Many a child, as a direct result of having to go to school, now has impaired vision or is nervous and emotionally unbalanced or has tuberculosis or caught a communicable disease and now has impaired hearing. Schooling frequently leaves its mark. To find these sources of problems, and to discuss the adjustments necessary to meet them, is a splendid subject for health instruction.

7. Analyses of home life. What problems are created by the home? What sort of health conditions are found there? This is a rich source for student

8. Analyses of community life. If there are great sources of infection in the community environment, if there are no playgrounds useful in combatting idleness, if the water or food supply is unsafe because of lack of sanitary measures, or if sources of pollution abound, these make fit subjects for discussion in health instruction.

9. Analyses of literature. What do students read?

10. Analyses of modern communications. What programs on radio and television affect the health of children? What are the influences of commercials?

11. Analyses of the findings from physical examinations.

12. Analyses of school health records.

These are sources of needs and interests, and with probing on the part of the teacher and the students they can be brought out for classroom discussion. As measures of the daily problems of living, they are favorable media for effective learning about health.

The Mental Health of Children

To many of us there is no more fascinating study than that of the adjustment of youth to the favorable and adverse circumstances of their world. Once it is possible to throw aside preconceived notions, obstructing superstitions, and 19th-century concepts of "childrearing," one can strike gold in the promising fields of problem-discovery and action-planning in regard to the mental health of children. As of now, child behavior is relatively unpredictable. We know little about it. And yet our generation of investigators has made great progress in revealing to those of us who teach or otherwise work with children some of the conditions under which our work can best go on.

It was J. K. Hall, twenty years ago, who said:

Most of the difficulty in modern life is not caused by our struggle with matter, but with our own beliefs and our own thoughts, and with the thoughts of others. The field of man's battle is within his own mind—with his own instincts, his own thoughts, his own feelings. His life is made constantly more difficult, not only by the multitudinous devices with which he has to work but even more so by the network of laws and customs with which he has entangled himself. Most of the tragedies of life are due to conflicts between primitive ways and the demands of civilization.

Delivered at the annual meeting of the Association for Childhood Education International, Seattle, Washington, March 27, 1951.

If there are those who are alarmed about the mental health of our population, if we are unhappy about such contemporary matters as morals, manners, and values, it would be well to examine the character of the environment we have built for an adolescent of today. Let us say he is 17 years old. He was born in 1934. He went to school at about the time Hitler was beginning his destruction of the Western world. Six million Jews were in the process of being murdered. A quarter of a million Americans were soon to give their lives to a cause that they little understood. The papers of his elementary years were filled with news of the fascist aggression abroad and of social upheaval at home.

In childhood he saw six years of the most terrifying war the world has known. These children have never known peace. In early adolescence, lately that is, he has seen danger, threats, hydrogen bombs, the draft, strikes, walkouts, talk of bacterial warfare, anxiety over high prices, a rising suicide rate, quick marriages, insecure teachers, and immorality in his sports. What a world! These young people have lived in times characterized in almost every respect by moral retrogression.

The effort the 17-year-old must expend to develop those sturdy qualities of personality that mark him as "emotionally mature," "psychologically stable," or more simply, "well adjusted" is prodigious. We, the adults of his world, are slowly driving him to distraction. It is more of a wonder that our children survive psychologically than it is that a few million of them crack up!

What are the facts? There are so many of them one has to choose among them. Among third-grade children, 15 to 20 percent need psychological attention right now. They are beginning to show signs of poor mental health. Among 15-year-olds, we can count on one out of every 20 being committed for psychiatric care before going much further in life. Among the 18-year-olds, that group of stalwart and courageous boys and girls upon whom we place so much of the burden of this world that we have been unable to carry, 10 percent of the boys will be so unfit emotionally that they will be rejected from military life. To be sure, girls are better adjusted than boys, but in neither case is there any cause for cheering.

Some studies show that there are fewer disturbing tensions in rural areas; at least rural children show a greater sense of personal security and freedom from nervous mannerisms. High school students who have friends are better off psychologically than those who are less popular. Friendship seems an important ingredient in the prescription for psychological stability. The brighter students have a higher level of mental health than those who are retarded. The old saw that one can be "just as happy as if he had good sense" is inappropriate because it rarely can be true.

The facts of the case are worth your investigation. The situation is now more savory than it was when smallpox and tuberculosis were rampant in the 17th century—or in the 18th when cancer and diabetes went unrecognized until they struck down at the end. We are today, in our understanding, prevention, and treatment of mental health problems, only a little bit further along than that.

Where does advance in the understanding of mental health problems begin? One who would understand must bring to the task a mind free from the prejudices and archaic ideas and be willing to admit that we are not very close to the ultimate solution let alone an understanding of causes of mental health problems. But progress is being made. For example, it is estimated that some 300 million children are living in underdeveloped areas on low-protein diets, starving for want of food in areas hit by drought. They may never be able to "catch up" mentally with their richer counterparts in other parts of the world. Dr. Winick of Cornell found direct evidence in humans that the damage to the brain of a human infant may be irreversible if malnutrition begins before six months of age. Early malnutrition, early disease, early neglect or child abuse are seen now as causes of serious aberrations of behavior in adolescence.

The early awareness of prejudice, for example, is now being recognized as one of the psycho-social causes of a childhood form of mental illness. The dawn of the awareness of ethnic difference (color or religious variations) leaves impressions devastating to later mental health. A case in point: Ruth.

I can remember Ruth so well—a charming and lovable 16-year-old whose parents moved to a strange town and put her in a public school. Soon she became ill, pleaded to stay home from school, was nauseated at the thought of school. Thoughtful people took over, found Ruth was meeting rejection at school for the first time, helped her develop a skill (no more complex than expertness at volleyball), and soon Ruth's mental problem vanished. Ruth's illness, you see, stemmed from her first experience with anti-Semitism, and her acceptance was restored because her classmates loved a winner more than they disliked a deviate.

Investigators find the study of the mental health problems of youth embryonic, fascinating, and promising. They are probing and experimenting, and it is reasonable to believe that some day we will understand—as some day we will understand cancer—the ways best to motivate a child, the influences of competition, the dynamics of group action, the ways to teach good behavior, the means of preventing the anxieties and tensions that lead to psychoses. Some day we will understand these things and be able to help children vastly more than we now can.

What are the currently apparent origins of psychological maladjustment? The study of them presents opportunities for studying relationships. One most certainly has to deal with origins before a plan of action can be developed. Most of the time the problem is to help the youngster who finds difficulty at a time, at a place, or in a set of circumstances that irritate. Many of these experiences in maladjustment are something like scarlet fever, or poliomyelitis; they come, cause great distress while they last, impair growth and retard development, perhaps leave some scar tissue. They may even be fatal. Their origins are important; the media in which they grow and the means of transmission are as significant as if we were studying communicable disease. One writer has described these causes as follows:

There are probably no one or two big causes of poor adjustment among adolescents, such as great emotional shocks, malnutrition, or inherited defects. It is more probably that the causes are to be found in an accumulation of little things—small and repeated blows to the child's ego, small emotional hurts repeated over and over. These may add up to unrelieved anxiety, pent-up inferiority feelings, distorted impressions, warped attitudes, and emotional carryovers which are the substance of mental ill health.

It is the specificity of these origins that intrigues us in education. We know that the cumulative influence of the school experience has a bearing upon child health. One could not confine a child roughly five hours a day, five days a week, thirty weeks a year, for twelve years, to an environment in which he or she reacts to pressures, meets success and failure, is victimized by or gets along with others—an environment in which the child is led to believe that he or she will never amount to anything really important in life unless he or she is successful there. The school experience is powerful. An analysis of its day-by-day, hour-by-hour influence on a child's life will reveal how necessary it is for educators to accept their responsibility for their share of the mental health conditions found among our people. If the population is seemingly losing its sanity, then the school must look at its influence to see whether, during the formative years, it does as much good as it does harm.

Here is an area of study that can be commended to anyone interested enough to make an analysis of school life to find factors that unfavorably influence emotional stability. We must not deal with them in broad generalizations. We must not be content to say, "Competition is an evil factor; we must substitute cooperation for it." That is too much like saying "sitting in drafts causes colds," when no research on the common cold has as yet proven that statement conclusively. Competition is a tool to be used. It may be used unwisely in a science class and thus produce frustration and despair in the heart of a 12-year-old who wants greatly to be well thought of but who did not build as good a crystal set as someone else. Or it may be used wisely in the same class to spur

the group on to revealing even more interesting facts of an assignment, because the children vie with each other to see who can bring in the most recent advances on the subject at hand.

Competition need not be condemned as such, any more than we condemn night air or starchy foods or vigorous exercise. It all depends upon how it is used, and thus it is these dependencies we must study, these situations in which individual children react to the circumstances that surround them and that must be explored. We cannot now accept the old familiar clichés like "spare the rod and spoil the child" or "let the baby cry—he'll soon learn not to" any more than we accept "an apple a day keeps the doctor away." Such generalizations are merely convenient "outs" for the one who is baffled in the search for an understanding of some particular aberration of child life.

We must be more scientific, more specific. We must come to understand and accept the practice of the differential diagnosis. We must be able to separate the many influences and experiences in school from each other and see them at work on a particular child at a particular time. This has been the experience in other phases of preventive or therapeutic effort; there is little reason to believe we shall escape such careful individualizing of our efforts in the mental health field.

When we see a child who is "nervous" or upset or a "problem," we must know that such personality traits did not develop overnight. A child does not develop these traits all at once and as a general quality of his life any more than he becomes honest or courageous or trustworthy all at once as some God-given, inherited quality. Youngsters are ushered into the world neither Protestant nor Catholic, honest or untruthful, fearful or courageous, deceitful or guileless. They have potentials to be sure, but without specific environmental influences playing upon them these potentials will not be seen. We are what we have learned. And if the youngsters hear the words "tattle-tale," or "chicken," or "be good," they do not know what they mean until they have specific experience in the circumstances described by the words. No child is naturally "nervous" in the sense that he has to keep biting his nails or tapping his feet or screaming at sudden noises. The feelings inside make children do those things, their reactions to previous experiences, the "build-up." The clue to rectifying is to study the child, examine his record, locate his emotional allergies, find the irritations that inflame them.

And what about the home? Volumes have been written about its influence. Tens of thousands of meetings have been held to aid parents understand their influence upon the health of their children. Presumably not one of them has been wasted motion, for the arrow points straight at the home: as the place where the early influences are felt and lasting impressions are made. When parents

stand by their children when the children are in difficulty, when they show by words and action that the child is loved, when they have fun together as a family, when they are consistent in the way they deal with their children, and when they are understanding of them, then the home creates the atmosphere in which children have the best chance of being well adjusted.

The home will have to be examined, like the school, to find those specific situations that make for tensions. The argument over the television set, the friction over race relations, the disapproval of a boyfriend, the constant belittling of one's efforts, the fear that the son will grow up to know more than the father—these and scores of others are the elements that we must deal with in the solution of adjustment problems.

Can we describe the broad outlines of a program that will favorably affect the development of good adjustment to this anything-but-comfortable environment in which we live? At the risk of being either trite or unscientific or both, let me suggest several characteristics such a program would have.

First of all, let us examine the sort of life we think is good. Do we want children to live in tranquility and peace? In friendship with one another where hatreds are gone and rivalries are friendly ones? Do we want them to respect one another, to honor their competitors, to develop an atmosphere of democratic acceptance and equality? Do we pray for the development of self-respect and security, which will produce confidence rather than ulcers, satisfaction rather than frustration? If we do then we must remember that these things are not learned or acquired in the abstract. We cannot *talk* a child into becoming democratic. The child becomes democratic by doing those things that are later called democratic, by living democratically in specific relationships. Thus, we must provide specific experiences in democratic living, concrete evidence that persons are equal, specific assistance in discriminating between an ungracious act and a sporting one.

If we believe it is best to become calm, composed, fair-minded, or poised, then we must temper the frenzy of an overstimulating school situation with its hyperthyroidal basketball tournaments, for example, its synthetic enthusiasms for so many unimportant things. One cannot preach ethics. They have to be lived. One cannot expect children to grow up to take charge of their lives if during the school years they are never given a chance to make a decision. One cannot appreciate the democratic way unless one lives it in a hundred different specifics each day.

Today's problem of bringing up a child in the way he should go would baffle a Rousseau whose concern for Emile was no greater than ours today. In this world of ours where the beauties of our natural surroundings are sometimes

soiled by thievery and the waste of exploitation, in this world of immorality, hypocrisy, violence, subversiveness, and self-seeking, what values can we inculcate? What censure can we invoke when old-fashioned virtues are found missing? How can we seriously condemn aspiring young basketball players who yield to bribes when bribery and influence are commodities as freely sold as eggs and butter in the high places of our national life?

A second item in the broad outline of a program is the necessity of somehow making virtues as clear, as real, as understandable as vices. If we want favorable attitudes toward work or the church or parents, they should not be preached about or their values exhorted, but satisfying experiences with each in some understandable detail must be had. For example, nature seems to have made us all—dogs, cats, humans, and monkeys—to feel better if we feel superior, at least to something. If my plane did not fly faster than yours then my headwinds were stronger. If you are taller than I, well, at least my skin is whiter. If we have no television, we have two cars. We give the person who wants to brag a little hardly a chance to finish before we properly put him in his place by the recitation of our own achievements. Not even a good stirring account of how Uncle Sam wrecked our pocketbooks with his income tax is allowed to stand for long. Someone is sure to come along who suffered superior anguish and who is broke much flatter than we.

Growth and development refer not merely to long bones and bicuspid, but to egos as well. And just as tallness needs long bones and long bones need vitamins, so also does personality need ego and ego-development need superiority. We need to experience superiority in something. We cannot live inferior to everybody in everything.

But is there a difference between ego-development and egocentricity? Is there a difference between group pride and ethnocentricity? Can we find the clue here to the racial and religious tensions that figure so largely in our national life? Children are reasonably free from such bigotry, but soon the adult teaches them, in order to preserve their personal or group superiority, that they must be snobbish or prejudiced or that they must hate. Such anti-personal attitudes are evidence of illness.

The unhappy newsstand attendant in an Alabama railroad station, as reported the other day, who insulted a Negro who crossed over the Jim Crow line to buy a paper, is suffering. The Northwesterner who angrily states that his country isn't what it used to be because of the influx of "hunkies and niggers" is ill psychologically. Many who hold to mean, bitter prejudices, who nourish their snobbishness, do so because their lives are so impoverished, so lacking in personal culture that they greedily preserve their fancied superiority at cost to others. Here is a tremendous opportunity for concerted guidance from both

home and school to unite in an educational program that will direct our native need for being superior into channels where it will not impede the development of others who have the same impulses.

Third, we must realize that children must be helped to develop ample resources for joy, for self-entertainment. To live a life wholly dependent upon the superficial stimulations of friends, radio, movies, ballgames, and the thousands of other forms of entertainment a community thoughtfully provides may be dangerous. We need inner resources for contentment, inner strength to support ourselves when we cannot rely safely on the quality of support provided by others. In books, in writing, in the arts and crafts, in games and sports are to be found such resources. The problem is so to teach or to guide children that they become happy or find satisfactions from and with things they find to do themselves, things they have created within themselves. How soon, for example, can we persuade the people in charge that the most important part of our great national effort in games and athletics is that which brings to every girl and boy some skill and joy from his own attainment and that the great championship spectacles, the bowl games and tournaments, are pleasant but materially inconsequential as solutions of some of our critical and chronic problems of youth? More money, space, time, and leadership for youth and community enterprises where millions can participate and thus find satisfactions are involved. Here, with the great majority of people is to be found the real problem—not with our stars and our professionals. Our youth need to cultivate their own resources in joy and not be denied their chance to learn to ice-skate, read or write stories, act out a part in a community show, or learn the fiddle or the zither, for their own, if not others', satisfaction.

Perhaps, in conclusion, we can catch the spirit of the best advice of the times when we summarize the needs of youth in the following statements:

1. All of us, young or old, seek status. We have to "be somebody" to be respected, to feel confident. If we cannot earn this distinction we will steal it, or fake it, or peremptorily demand it. This urge is at the root of many behavior problems and must be satisfied by providing children with spheres in which they can acceptably be superior to others in some respect.
2. When handicaps, organic or otherwise, doom children to disappointment, to a lowered achievement, one of the great contributions teachers can make to them is to help them find compensation by developing skill in other ways.
3. Our times seem to lead toward finding the cheap way, the easy out, the unearned security. Money is plentiful, wages are good. Neither our income nor our debt have ever been higher. Profits are astronomical. To make "an easy buck" is more alluring than to cultivate the enduring skills of competency or

patiently developed wisdom. It is more tempting to become a "wise guy" than a wise person, and therein lies many of our problems of difficult behavior and delinquency.

4. Youth show clearly that they need something to tie to, something solid, something in which they can believe. They see national heroes with feet of clay; they doubt their freedom because our law-swatch-hunters make it uncertain to be free; they see a large portion of the world's threat and others coming to us uncertain. Are there enduring virtues? We must make them clearer, more specifically clear to youth than we ever have. Can we substitute a belief in freedom and faith in themselves for the uncertainty, and cynicism found in many today? We can if we will make a goal. If teachers, parents, social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, religious workers, and others concerned will work in mutual respect and confidence, without the petty professional enmities that thwart progress, we will favorably affect this great national problem. The development of child-study centers, school psychological services, mental health clinics, and other enterprises is urgently needed. The problem belongs to us all. Its solution will provide rich dividends to individuals and to our national welfare.

RELATED READINGS

- Faculty of the University School. *How Children Develop*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1946.
- Fenton, Norman. *Mental Hygiene in School Practice*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1943.
- Hymes, James L., Jr. *Teachers Listen—The Children Speak*. New York: State Charities Aid Association, 1949.
- Jenkins, Gladys G.; Shacter, Helen; and Bauer, William W. *These Are Your Children*. New York: Scott-Foresman Co., 1949.
- Joselyn, Irene, M., M.D. *Psycho-Social Development of Children*. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1948.
- Mangus, A. R. and Seeley, John R. *Mental Health Needs in a Rural and Semi-Rural Area of Ohio*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1947.
- Mangus, A. R. and Woodward, R. H. *Analysis of Mental Health of High School Students*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1949.
- Rennie, Thomas A. C. and Woodward, Luther E. *Mental Health in Modern Society*. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1948.
- Woodward, R. H. and Mangus, A. R. *Nervous Traits Among First Grade Children in Butler County Schools*. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1949.

A Challenge to the Professions

Many professional groups have a legitimate interest in the health of school children. Nurses, physicians, health educators (both school and public), dentists, physical educators, nutritionists, and school psychologists are learning to share their experiences, as they explore their common interest.

Here we meet in assembly. The purpose of this annual gathering is to practice together. It is like batting practice, when we help each other improve our swing, criticize the other fellow's stance, and help him level on the ball no matter who is doing the throwing, so that when the game begins on the home field we will be improved players as a result of our association with this organization.

The focus of our mutual interest is clear enough—the child, the young person in school, the growing and developing human being. We are all mutually concerned about the child's welfare. We want to see the child live a long and prosperous life, not struck down with polio or run over by an automobile or later caught in the web of an unhappy home life. We hope to be able, through our pooled efforts, to give the child sound counsel that will be useful and effective throughout life. We hope that as a result of our efforts the child will know better how to live a good life and meet problems intelligently.

Delivered at the general session of the American School Health Association, Kansas City, Missouri, November 14, 1955.

We are people with a shared concern. We seek the same ends. We want to achieve the same results. We combine our various talents to do a job unique to the 20th century—namely, to improve the quality of human life and living through the agency of the school. Schools here and elsewhere were, in previous centuries, relatively unconcerned about the learner, the child. They wanted the child to learn, to amass knowledge, to pass subjects, to read and write and figure. But the effort to give young persons a better purchase on their own life, to safeguard and improve its quality, is a recent, and disputed, concept.

Knowing what we know about the human organism, we are not greatly impressed with this former concept of a school. We know that many still think it exists solely to transmit knowledge, to recapitulate and deepen the culture, to improve communication among people. Others are content if the school develops those skills that will give the child a start on making an economic way in the world. We recognize those views. But we believe them to be limited, because we know that none of this business of education can go on successfully without taking into account the receptivity, the readiness of the whole child for it, and any educational program from kindergarten to university had better be planned with that in mind.

For us the outstanding fact, the fact that brings these professional groups together in a common bond, the fact that tells us we had better work together or else, is the fact of the oneness, the wholeness of the human being. Aristotle knew all about this. So did John Locke. But the poets of the Middle Ages and the clerics of the early church, and the scholars who dreamed up the unholy fictions about humanity would have none of it. They gave us the atomistic concept. They pulled the human apart. They separated humans into mind, body, and spirit and conceived the school as a place to train the mind. They glorified the spirit and degraded the body. They held in contempt those who concerned themselves with anything physical. Their lineal descendants are about us now, preaching the doctrine that schools need have no part of any mental health movement or that physical education is something unwanted and profane to the sacredness of an academic hall.

This separatist view has profoundly shaped American education. To my way of thinking it is the most influential of all the forces that have a bearing upon the American school. It has so molded the beliefs and understandings of people as to make it virtually impossible, in some school systems and in some universities, to place the things in which this association is interested in more than an auxiliary or caretaking role. In these places we are looked upon as competent babysitters while the main business of education is carried on by the Adleresque giants of an exclusive intellectualism.

Conversely, there are those *among us* who so believe in this ancient atomistic

view that they believe a cardiac inferiority is merely a cardiac inferiority and has no bearing upon any aspect of personality development or intellectual attainment. To them a nurse is no counselor, merely a sterilizer, and a physician is merely an appendage to education who can reset the dislocated thumb, diagnose the impetigo, or issue the appropriate warnings to parents about mumps. I shudder to think what some of the atomistic physical educators think of themselves! They believe their principal mission in life is to develop, through exercise, a physical fitness based almost exclusively on muscular strength unrelated to purpose, drive, function, mood, or any other aspect of life.

None of those views is tenable. We sense that. But we must be *sure* of it. That is, we must be sure of the nature and meaning of the child's integrated state. It is only here that we find our strength in education. If we do not know this or if we are insecure in our conviction on this, if we as educators, physicians, and nurses are not impressed with the overpowering meaning of the fact of a human's unity then we had better start reading. We should read Hopkins,¹ and Witmer and Kotinsky,² and Angyal.³ We should read Arthur Mangus on the social components of sickness and health,⁴ and Kelley and Rasey's little book *Education and the Nature of Man*.⁵ We should know Hartmann's *Educational Psychology*⁶ for its discussion of the dependence of psychological phenomena upon the state of the body, and not to know Cattell's study of *Personality*⁷ is to miss a great deal. Anything we can read on the correlation of psychic and somatic disorders, like Fetterman's article,⁸ is illuminating. Alexander,⁹ Flanders Dunbar,¹⁰ Kluckhohn and Murray,¹¹ and Gardner Murphy's *Personality—A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure*¹² are standard works for any of us who earnestly want a solid footing for an appraisal of the kind of work we do.

To realize that the whole child comes to school, that the whole child is educated, that reactions spring from the unified organism, that however mathematics or history or physical education or a physical examination are received by a child they bear totally upon his or her development, is to make it clear that many kinds of professional people have to do with the educational process. The nurse is not merely an applicator of bandages, the physical educator not merely a bull in a china shop, and the physician not merely a dispenser of the Salk vaccine. The conception of unity as the basic nature of the human being not only assumes us to be of professional worth in the developmental lifeline of a child, but it opens up for us—if we will but see it and use it—an opportunity to make the school health team the leading influence in child development. If we will take time to learn about humans and not merely their parts, if we will see our problem not in provincial terms, if we will take time to find out what the educational process is all about, and if we will see what and who we ourselves are and can be—then we will achieve an inestimable usefulness to the developmental progress of young people.

If this usefulness commences at the point of complete understanding of the nature of the human being, then the second step is the exploration of current and potential interrelationships. How do I relate to you—and you to me? If the nurse is struggling to deal with an accident-prone child, it may be that by working with physical education teachers some light on the personality inferiority that may dispose toward accidents can be discovered. Or it may be that a neuromuscular rehabilitation program can be instituted, which will go a long way toward reducing the number of accidents the child has.

If physical education teachers want to develop a thorough program of physical education for all children, not just some of them, they are dependent upon the physician and the nurse for the medical and diagnostic background on each child as a basis for classification into the various parts of a modern program. No physical education program can be conducted without appropriate medical advice.

Maybe the physician is dealing with a psychosomatic situation originating in a rejection situation stemming from the social life of the patient. The physician should know the importance of sport skill as an "open sesame," as a counterbalancing acceptance factor. By working actively with physical education teachers, the physician may be able to solve the medical problem.

Surely no school dentist needs to be reminded of the personality implications of disfiguring teeth. Likewise, school dentists are aware of their importance to the health educator who needs information in order to teach young people something about dental care.

Children with heart disease used to be barred from all physical education. Now the physician and the physical educator come together to work out a limited or adapted program for these children with cardiac histories.

The nurse dealing with a fatigued child knows how antidotal vigorous play may be and urges participation rather than restrictions in appropriate cases.

The physician should be aware of the usefulness of the screening talents of nurses and teachers, because when such screening is well planned, the contribution the physician makes is enhanced. Conversely, the nurse needs the penetrating and sensitive cooperation of the physician to deal not only with the pupil-patient but with the anxious parents who want straight talk and not evasion.

The relation of physical education and medicine alone is one of infinite possibilities. Cooperation, research, and understanding on such matters as bed rest versus early ambulation, prescription (individually, not by groups) of

therapeutic exercise, the convalescence of cardiac and circulatory patients, convalescence in general, the use of exercise in orthopedies and surgery, in obstetrics and gynecology, and in psychiatry will be useful.¹³ It is frequently suggested that we need to develop another specialty in the medical field comparable to the "sport doctor" in Europe who is adept at research and practice in the broad and fruitful field of sports medicine. In spite of the great numbers who participate in sport in this country, we have only nonmedical athletic trainers, a few medical advisers to teams, our school physicians, and a scattering of unorthodox others who pay some attention to the medical aspects of training, conditioning, performance, prevention of injuries, and the physiology of exercise. We all could use more shared information in this area.

The reciprocal relationships between classroom teachers, teachers of science or health, and of the researcher or clinical practitioner in the health sciences is classic. The history of the control of communicable diseases for which preventive measures have been found, of the control of deficiency diseases or nutritional aberrations, the record of public understanding and use of scientific medical services in general is a story of reciprocity. You supply me with the information, I'll pass it on, and together we will get the work done with a receptive public. Today we have a relatively well-cared-for public, medically and dentally speaking, and much of that is attributable to the efforts of the educator in schools and colleges.

There is a wealth of experience now available illustrating the importance of the team approach in solving individual and group problems. The electrical engineer and the pathologist cooperate in the construction of machines for inducing fever. The physicist and the gynecologist are indispensable to each other as they explore the use of isotopes in uterine cancer. The social caseworker, the orthopedist, and the corrective therapist make a team of experts, each sharing in the rehabilitation of the industrial accident case.

It should be clear that the team approach to the solution of some of our problems would be helpful. Perhaps we should start at the level of administration. There are many ways to organize and conduct a school health and physical education program in order to get maximum efficiency. Thus it would be reasonable to expect that pooled experience and opinion is better than one person's judgment as the group seeks for the best adaptation to the local situation. Furthermore, a group judgment is more likely to produce action than is a didactic "telling" of others what to do.

The pressing and constant task of curriculum construction in health education needs team judgment for most effective planning. It is wiser for many judgments to be used regarding what to teach to whom and when than merely the judgment of one expert. This seems difficult for some persons to under-

stand. A few seem to believe that there is a body of information about health that every child should know and that all one has to do is wrap it up in neat grade packages and deliver it, preferably by the lecture method. Experts in curriculum know this is not so. They know that research on need, consultation with many who have contributions to make, participation by students in the planning, and group discussion are all a part of modern curriculum techniques. The "health team" has a group job to do here in a very real sense.

Certainly in dealing with a problem in the development of an individual child, there is just as much reason for us to pool our judgments as there would be in the illustration used from the field of cleft palate rehabilitation. The physical education teacher sees one facet of the problem, the nurse another, the physician a third. Together with the parents and teachers some synthesis of judgment can be arrived at that will probably be different from what it would have been had anyone gone it alone and that will have the added merit of being the product of multiple observations. This sort of approach to problems may cost more time and effort than the unilateral method, but in most instances it will make better sense because it will be more productive of sound results.

Here, then, is one aspect of our "challenge." A challenge is a "call to a contest of skill." The call asks us to become a team of cooperating persons, each making a contribution in terms of his best lights but, more important, each listening to and learning from the other and aiding in the solution—which may not be recognized as that proposed by anyone in its original form. We are challenged to seek a synthesis—not a choice.

This is difficult. This takes skill. It requires patience, study, understanding, and an intellectual modesty to permit us to be less inclined to insist on our way to the neglect of the merit found in the way of somebody else. It requires the elimination of some of our stereotypes by which we judge all teachers, or all physicians, or all nurses in a one-dimensional manner. How often, for example, have some of us been guilty of saying, "Well, there's no use even considering what the physical education teacher had to say. He's just a dumb coach intent on winning and cares nothing at all for the personal aspects of the student's life." Or, "The nurse? No, there is no judgment there worth seeking." Or, "Dr. School? No, if he were a good doctor he would be in private practice." These stereotypes and others like them have to be shattered. To divide the world into bad and good on the basis of judgments made on evidence gathered incompletely from a few experiences prevents growth and understanding and impedes the development of this team approach so badly needed in dealing with problems arising from school life. A physician will understand an educator better if he is willing to slip into the educator's shoes and try his argument on to see how it fits. And vice versa. It would be healthy indeed if we all would (a) spend part of a month's time reading up on ~~the other person's~~ ^{another person's} field;

(b) spend part of every conference deliberately listening to the other person's view rather than try to show our own brightness by grabbing the floor and holding it against all comers; and (c) when the other person has little contribution to make be patient instead of condemning.

In such union there is strength. I heard a nationally prominent person say to a general session at a state teachers' convention the other day that he would remove from the school any work whatsoever in mental health, physical health, or recreation. He meant it. And he is not without influence in American education.

A beloved and respected dean of a fine liberal arts college asked the other day what the men in our university who do not make the varsity teams "do for exercise." It was a perfectly reasonable question, but it was asked in a context that made it clear he has virtually no understanding of what physical education is or can be in the educational program of the college. An examination of the required freshman curriculum of that college shows no mention of any instruction in health and nothing in physical education. The activities of the college health service are respected for the same reason we associate a veterinarian with any good racing stable. Someone has to look after the animals. In this college, the main business is the cultivation of the intellect, and nothing, or virtually nothing, that might inform the student in the realm of the art and science of living is of much count.

The worker in the vineyard of public health frequently has an easier time of it. He or she is better understood because he or she is protecting the public against its enemies and bringing to them information and action that they will accept or reject.

School health workers have an added problem. Not only must they get the acceptance or rejection of the student public, their ultimate consumer, but they have a middleman to satisfy and persuade. They must convince the teacher, the administrator, the dean that what they do with children is educational, not merely preventive or therapeutic, that their program advances knowledge and understanding, cultivates an intimate relationship with contemporary culture, and in every respect bears a kinship with the much-sought-after general or liberal education.

The basis for such a program in both its operational and philosophic sense is a thorough understanding of the nature of the child. We must persist in our efforts to make the true nature of the child known to all. The child must be seen as an entity, an indivisible totality. When the child gets his Salk vaccine he is not merely being inoculated for polio. He is being affected totally—his attitudes, his feeling of self, his knowledge of immunology, his relation to parent, family,

and friends. This is the root. This understanding of child life—his basic nature and his subsequent nurture—transcends all of the specialities of all of us. It is wider and deeper than medicine, broader than all of education, more complex than nursing, and more inclusive than dentistry. Our only hope of understanding what a child is—and what can be done to aid and abet the child's best interests—is to read widely about him, study his life and his problems, and listen carefully to others as they bring their evidence to the conference table.

The years of evolution of the science and art of educating children is still in danger of being set back by the irresponsible and uninformed critics of modern education who would have us give up all except the classical reading, writing, and arithmetic. Scientists, philosophers, and the professional educator know how unsound, how wasteful, how contrary to the facts of human life this position is. The American people want the education of their children to be successful. They want their children to make the most of their opportunities. This means that the school must be as concerned about the ability of the child to *receive* an education as it is concerned about what is taught or what the child does with it. Concern, therefore, about the health of children—about the physical, mental, and social welfare of the child—is an absolute necessity in modern education. Programs directed toward this end are neither frills nor luxuries but are basic to the successful accomplishment of any program of education that aims to help the child become an effective person.

This is our challenge!

NOTES

1. Lawrence T. Hopkins, *Integration, Its Meaning and Application* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1937).
2. Helen L. Witmer and Ruth Kotinsky, eds., *Personality in the Making* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1952).
3. Andras Angyal, *Foundations for a Science of Personality* (Commonwealth Fund, 1941).
4. Arthur R. Mangus, "Medical Sociology: Study of the Social Components of Illness and of Health," *Sociology and Social Research* 39, no.3, Jan.-Feb. 1955.
5. Earl C. Kelley and Marie I. Rasey, *Education and the Nature of Man* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1952).
6. George W. Hartmann, *Educational Psychology* (New York: American Book Co., 1941).
7. Raymond B. Cattell, *Personality. A Systematic, Theoretical and Factual Study* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950).
8. Joseph L. Fetterman, "The Correlation of Psychic and Somatic Disorders," *Journal of the American Medical Association* 106, no. 1, Jan. 1936.
9. Franz Alexander, *Psychosomatic Medicine—Its Principles and Applications* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1950).
10. Flanders Dunbar, *Mind and Body—Psychosomatic Medicine* (New York: Random House, 1947).
11. Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry A. Murray, *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948).

12. Gardner Murphy, *Personality -- A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1947), Part IV.
13. "The Relationship of Physical Education to Medicine," a paper prepared by H. Harrison Clarke et al. for the American Academy of Physical Education, 1953.

Guidelines for Teacher Preparation

We recognize that teacher preparation in physical education, health education, and recreation can and should never be standardized throughout the United States. Efforts to evaluate curriculums for the preparation of such teachers by the use of common denominators of measurement can be only partially effective because of the host of variables. The essence of these evolving three fields is one of change and improvement; it would be completely irrational to expect sameness. The preparation of guidelines becomes dangerous business. They must be presented with full understanding that their wisdom needs to be tested against the contemporary social and biological scene and also against the declared objectives and purpose of the institutions doing the preparation. We offer these guidelines, therefore, merely as points for discussion.

1. Professional students in physical education should know the difference between physical education and physical training. These terms are not synonymous, and although at one time in history they might have been used interchangeably, it becomes clear now that differentiation can and must be made. Physical education involves an abundance of thinking, self-guided action, evaluation of experience, analysis of consequences, and choice. Physical training involves patterned behavior, leader evaluation and response-to-command activity involved in drill but a minimum of thinking and self-directed

Delivered at the Midwest Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Detroit, Michigan, 1964.

activity. It relies upon exercise for physical development without regard for its total impact on the person. To understand the difference thoroughly, a student has to be prepared well in the educational literature of both the 19th and 20th centuries, selected for its pertinence to the purposes of education in general vis-a-vis the growing child in a free society.

2. Professional students in health education and physical education should be made aware of the contemporary emerging patterns for education in both format and content in order to adapt the curriculums in these two fields to the complex needs of the society which these emerging patterns are attempting to meet. This goal would also require a wide reading of the current literature relating to the evolving patterns of education in America. Students should know what is happening to the self-contained classroom and about the emerging curriculum formats for the future. They should know about the instructional projects of the National Education Association and should be acquainted with the activities of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and its Curriculum Commission. They should have a reasonable understanding of curriculum trends not only in our fields but in other fields in order to gain clues to the directions of curriculum evolution. There is no reason to believe, for example, that school and college health education and physical education, as now taught in schools and colleges, will remain in its traditional format or administrative context, nor is there any reason to believe that material taught now in health education or physical education will be taught 15 or 20 years from now. Therefore students should be prepared not to resist change but to accept it, not only to work along with it but to take the leadership in this kind of evolution.

3. Students in physical education and in recreation certainly should be better prepared to solve the emerging new problems in preparation for the use of leisure and should be able to make concrete responses to the needs of the white-collar unemployed, the unemployed adolescent, the housewife, and many other large segments of our populations whose leisure patterns are going to be altered as the passage of time creates new circumstances in the work-leisure cycle. They must be better prepared to introduce people to a wide range of interests and to develop appreciations, understandings, and appetites for outdoor pursuits and for art, drama, music, singing, playing, and dancing. They must be confronted with the problems involved in the development of a satisfying social life indoors as well as a life of activity in the out-of-doors. They must be made aware of the social, political, and industrial problems of urbanization as these problems encroach upon the use of space. Perhaps the preparation of school and college students in the activities useful to them at school and college age is insufficient; they must be made more acutely aware of leisure skills useful in adulthood.

4. We should strive for a rather pointed development of professional pride

and a consciousness of professional worth which will raise the professional student in our fields above the usual operational level where many of our people are now to be found. Our fields are now in competition with the quack, the proprietary muscle-builder, and the physical fitness "expert" who plies his trade without the scientific foundation our teacher preparation curriculums are capable of giving. It is not necessary for our graduates to be confused with the opportunist or the phony. Nor need we cooperate professionally with any and every local or national endeavor to develop or promote inadequate conceptions of the relation of exercise to the good life. Nor need we apologize for our efforts to relate the potential intellectual and social learnings inherent in our fields to the best cultural standards of our society. Our games and sports do not need to be conducted at the level of those who would exploit youth for personal or economic gain. Surely the student of physical education and recreation can be brought to see the significant relation between behavior on the playfield and behavior in our complex social milieu. Such problems as integration, rivalry, group hatred, and the search of the individual for worth can be highlighted as being clearly related to the experience on the playfield. Unless our students are impressed with these potentials, we miss a good share of the basic values of these two fields.

5. We should prepare athletic coaches and recreational leaders with an understanding of the serious and significant roles they play in our society. Too long have we failed to penetrate to the deeper meaning of athletic participation in the evolving personalities of the boys and girls who play. We have had enough evaluation by the scoreboard only. It is high time we began to cast our appraisal of both athletics and recreation in the more clinical terms of their social significance and their values in controlled adaptation to individual need. People will never take either athletics or recreational activity seriously until personnel in the fields take themselves seriously. Some day, it would be well, for example, to run some studies on the cultural contributions of sport or similar investigations of some penetration to match the endless reams of useless statistics on passes completed or field goal assists. In our search for excellence we have sometimes cited the competitive varsity programs as our answer to grandeur, but in so doing we have honored the ringmaster and forgotten the horses, made more out of the ceremony of presenting the cup than evaluated the effect of losing upon the vanquished.

6 We should hope that somehow we could inspire these students to read widely about this world of ours. Not only would they profit by broadening themselves as people, but they would gain deep and important insights into the significance and relationships of physical education to the human condition. This sort of reading, or listening, or travel would be mainly a cultural enterprise, not merely a "practical" or an improved way to master the balance beam or control the backswing. In the long run it would make better teachers out of

our people. Do they know Bernstein, Bergman, Martha Graham, William O. Douglas, John Cage, or Arthur Miller? Have they read *Profiles of Courage* or Edith Hamilton's *The Greek Way* or Viktor Frankl's *Man's Search for Meaning* or Huston Smith's *The Search for America* or maybe Eric Hoffer's *The True Believer*? Name two dozen more. Name oldtimers like H. G. Wells' *Outline of History* or Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*. Perhaps a grasp of social issues in American life can be obtained from the Weinbergs' *Attorney for the Damned—Clarence Darrow*. Could any of these fail to deepen the intellectual penetration of the student into the field of recreation, say, or the other two fields as well? It is out of such fabric that our scholars are formed.

These are suggested guidelines for the development of our curriculums in teacher education. Approval by NCATE does not mean we are at the pinnacle. The status quo is comfortable but limiting. The future in American education demands the steady and relentless destruction of sacred cows and the preservation of only the best in today's programs. The future will require new content, new administrative thinking, new ways of going about our business. We will be shot down if we do not keep pace with our changing society.

Section Three

Physical Education

A Holistic Point of View for Physical Education

From what I can gather, we share many problems in common as we attempt to develop a program of physical education for our respective lands. I can cite five of them at the outset:

1. What should the nature of physical education be in Australia and in the United States? Is there a particular type, a particular kind of program that will best fit our respective societies? Or are we committed to eclectic programs in order to satisfy the many diverse needs and goals of our people? Are there established national characteristics and purposes, biological or cultural, that should determine the nature of a physical education program?
2. Are there variations in the interpretation of the concept of the whole person that bear upon physical education?
3. Is or can physical education be a medium of learning, or is it merely a conditioning or body-building process? Do we seek to develop a program of physical education or physical training?
4. If physical education is developing in Australia as an eclectic program, trying to be all things to all men as it apparently is in the United States, what then is the relative place of games, fitness activities, dance and gymnastics, and all the other program components?

Delivered at the annual meeting of the Australian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Melbourne, January 18, 1968.

5. Can the nonacademic stigma be removed from physical education? Is this a field of study worthy of university recognition leading to the traditional credits, degrees, and other academic symbols?

In the course of this presentation I shall be bold enough to present some thoughts bearing, perhaps, upon all of these with emphasis upon the third: is physical education, or can it be, a medium of learning, or is it merely a physical conditioning process interspersed with pleasant games to satisfy the competitive urge of the young? Are we talking about a program of physical training or a program of physical education?

It is my considered opinion that to the extent you and I see physical education as an avenue of learning, it will prosper in the world of education and become a significant experience in the lives of our people. To learn through the experience in physical education is the principal, the most significant, value within our power to arrange. It transcends in importance all others, even those of the popular objective of fitness, or of self, or national aggrandizement through supremacy.

Learning has been and is the first and most lasting outcome of the physical experience. The primitive learned from climbing or combat; the child learns from jumping rope or water-skiing. The adult learns from tennis or a walk in the garden. Movement has always been a means for the development of understanding of oneself and one's world. This form of education is ancient, primitive, native. It predates spoken language or art as a means by which humans transmitted their cultural and developmental language to the coming generations. Physical education is the oldest means of learning known to humanity. It has served through the ages because of the inevitability of its importance, and it has persisted in this role regardless of how our contemporaries may have constructed a temporal or secular institution that purports to educate the young in the eternal verities.

Why? Because the person, whether the cleric or the academician knows it or not, is whole. The person cannot be divided, is not divided, and no matter what fiction we may concoct about mind and body, physical and mental, academic and nonacademic, these dichotomies bear no relation in fact to the essential nature of the person. The fact is that the person is a whole, is one, a psychophysical organism capable of reacting in many ways to the many and various emphases of stimuli to which one is exposed in the course of a lifetime. The root of this wholeness is, perforce, the cell. Its metabolism, its activity, its quality determine the expression of the organism that is made up of these millions of cells.

I trust I need not labor this point with you or cite the overwhelming evidence

for it. This wholeness is the outstanding fact confronting physical education today—in whatever country. To deny it, to overlook it, to ignore it is to set us chasing after secondary outcomes, oblivious to the central importance of physical education and perhaps afraid to take a stand on physical education as education. It is sometimes more convenient to deny our heritage and claim expediency and popularity through such obvious and simple values of fitness and victory. These two can be seductive mistresses, indeed!

Perhaps this timid point of view was well illustrated the other day by a graduate student in a physical education seminar who rather plaintively asked, “Why do we have to be concerned with moral and ethical and psychological and social problems, and not quietly be permitted to concentrate our efforts upon the physical development of our charges?” Such innocence is refreshing! Why not indeed?

It is this damnable fragmentation that has beset educational thinking for centuries and that persists to prejudice not only our students but our educational contemporaries. Fragmentation was the product of primitive efforts to understand humans and their world. It was helpful to develop categories, divisions, rubrics. So came the physical, the mental, the spiritual.

From that sort of fragmentation of the human being it was only logical that similar rubrics could be developed to categorize human knowledge. If the early philosophers and clerics could conveniently carve the person into the trichotomy and then proceed to develop the horrendous scale of prior values, with the spiritual resting safely on top and the physical on the bottom, then scholars could more conveniently explore one of these hypothetical categories without being overly concerned about the other two.

And thus the scholar in pursuit of knowledge assumed that the “intellectual” processes necessary to debate with Socrates, write a sonnet, discover the temperature of the moon, or rediscover the escapades of King Henry VIII were exclusively valuable and not to be confused with feats of strength or the derring-do of athletes.

Thus the “academic” life developed, and as knowledge broadened, information about the world became too much for one basket to hold. So now we have a plethora of categories—astronomy and ecology, rhetoric and literature, physics and chemistry, zoology and anthropology, geography and economics—each one alleged to be a “discipline,” a discrete something well fenced in against the intrusion of enlightenment from abroad. What chance had physical education, which by its very name could not be an intellectual or scholarly discipline because it did not deal with things intellectual?

We have the Greeks to thank for most of this. In spite of the fact that we moderns are supposed to be indebted to those ancients for their prototypes of physical education programs, I personally am not overly impressed with their contribution to our understanding of humanity and the problems that confront us today. To be sure, the Greeks sought health of the body. They had extensive gymnasiums, palestras. They started the Olympic games. Yet there was something lacking, something missing. I think it can be identified, because it has lived to haunt us and to keep us from full acceptance in the so-called academic circles.

The Greeks did not consider activity *per se* as having potential within it for the enrichment of self, as a means of relating to others, or as a means of learning about one's world. It was essentially a conditioning process, useful as a caretaking or developmental device to put the individual in shape to make war, to be a good citizen, or to be a slave. There is no evidence from Plato or Protagoras or Socrates that would lead me to believe that they understood that the dynamics of experience in movement could contribute to the thinking process or, in fact, was a part of the thinking process. Aristotle and Isocrates were devoted to rhetoric as the way of education, and they would encompass physical training in their system only because they sought a sound body to be the custodian for the sound mind—or to produce healthy young people for slavery or war.

Right there we can put our finger on an image of us that has lasted 2,000 years. We were useful to the welfare, and not to the education, of young people. In the pattern of the trichotomy—body, mind and spirit—we were body, nonintellectual, nonacademic, nonentities!

But now see what is happening! The walls of educational compartmentalization are crumbling! We now have geophysics, economic geography, biochemistry, and political science! The discrete disciplines are disappearing as humans press on to a revelation of what they and their world really are. Old answers are no longer good. *Relationships are being discovered and understood.* A new format is being developed for the study of humanity and its world. The emphasis is upon the function, the happening, and less upon the structure and the *status quo*. Concomitantly, further intensive study of the nature of humans—their physiology, the relation of endocrines to personality, the physiochemical nature of psychological aberrations, the significance of psychosomatic relationships—all of these are destroying any remnant of the human as an "intellectual" being whose education can be based on knowledge and its mastery alone.

And we in physical education are, whether we like it or not, right in the middle of this development. The movement experience is being seen not just as a developmental phenomenon but as an educational one.

We are beginning to realize that because of the inescapable oneness of man, what he *does*, how and why he *moves*, where he *goes* have a bearing upon his education. When the little child learns to jump rope there is much more to the product of the activity than improvement in coordination and cardiac return. Whether on the balance beam or tending goal, something is going on in the brain of the participant. We can either ignore it or plan for it and do something about it—but we can't wish it were not happening. It is within this ~~area~~ of total response that the educational potentialities of physical education reside.

As the walls between disciplines crumble, so does the wall between the physical and the intellectual. *We will soon have to make a choice.* We will have to make up our minds as to whether we are a field of learning or just a perspiratory art. We will have to decide whether we are caretakers or babysitters for the mind or whether we are central to the total development of the person. In short, are we devoted to a physical training or to a physical education?

Those two are different. I believe we should take time to outline the differences. I am of the opinion, having had experience as both student and teacher with both physical training and physical education, that there is more than a semantic difference. The differences are real and demonstrable and bear upon the relation of our field to education as a whole.

To differentiate we must begin with some consideration of what education is. Not everyone in our world understands that the common thread of an education is the development of the ability to think. This is the central purpose to which the school must be oriented if it is to accomplish either its traditional tasks or those newly accentuated by recent changes in the world. To say that it is central is not to say that it is the sole purpose or, in all circumstances, the most important one, but it must be a pervasive concern in the work of the school. Many agencies help to achieve educational objectives, but this particular objective—thinking—will ordinarily not be attained unless the school focuses on it. In this context, therefore, the development of the rational powers of every student must be recognized as centrally important.

If you were to ask me to define what I mean by "thinking," I would borrow from the philosopher Kilpatrick, whose definition is simply "all that the organism does in advance of overt action to size up the confronting situation and make plans for dealing with it; during action, to evaluate the process and shift the means, if need be, in order the better to effect the aim; and after action to draw lessons for the future from the whole experience." There are, of course, other outcomes to be defined in terms of personal growth, recognition and evaluation of oneself and one's powers, the development of an orientation or relation to others, a liberation from imposed authority, and certainly the

development of an adaptation to the culture in which one lives. These terms are significant and high-sounding but nevertheless real as we seek to guide the educative experience rather than to allow it to develop helter-skelter with no more assured outcome than the acquisition of knowledge.

Training, on the other hand, involves teaching, drill, or discipline by which the powers of mind or body are developed usually in preconceived directions or responses. The term is usually associated with the training of athletes or animals for specific performance to produce a response not necessarily chosen by the one who responds. Training does not involve choice upon the part of the one trained. Nor is it concerned with identity between the thing to be learned and the purposes of the learner.

Within this context then, what are the essential differences between physical training and physical education? I would like to describe the differences in four categories: purpose, orientation, method, and goals.

In terms of purpose, it has been traditionally clear that physical training aims to train the body in such tangibles as coordination, strength, physiological health, and endurance. It directs its attention to the production of the sound body as the vehicle for the housing of the sound mind. It admits the dichotomy of mind and body.

Physical education, on the other hand, purports to develop the whole person and is as concerned with one's intellectual, social, and ethical and spiritual development as it is with one's "physical" aspects. It recognizes no dichotomy. It sees the child as a person, not something to be exercised, not something to be dealt with in any fragmented sense. It realizes that what happens to a child happens all over, and it cannot limit responses to any given experience such as strength or endurance. A physical educator knows that such exercises designed to produce those limited objectives or purposes will nevertheless and inevitably have a bearing upon other aspects of the personality and the self-image of the participant.

In orientation, physical training becomes an end in itself. It seeks, through fixed and predetermined responses, immediate and measurable growth. The fitness score becomes the symbol of status. The skill of the performance becomes the end-all and be-all.

Physical education, on the other hand, recognizes that all of its activities are but means to an end, contributing to growth in function, to the enrichment of the quality of the personality, and to lifelong learning and participation. Physical education sees physical fitness not as an end in itself to be acquired, measured, and perhaps bragged about but as a means by which other and more socially useful ends of life can be attained.

In method, physical training has traditionally been authoritarian. It has used the response-command system of procedure. It has sought discipline—a discipline of response to one who gave the command and preconceived the kind of response thought necessary or desirable in the situation. It is the coach of the team calling the signals from the sidelines. It is the drillmaster ordering the class in calisthenics. The authority has characteristically been that imposed upon the student by force from the outside.

In physical education, we have sought the involvement and participation of the student in seeking the ends in view. It involves creative endeavor. It encourages problem solving. It has admitted students and their interests, purposes, and needs to the selection of the way in which the team is taught or the class proceeds. It is far more democratic than authoritarian in the way things get done. Motivation comes from the inside, and the discipline is a self-imposed one.

In goals, physical training has sought, as we have mentioned in our discussion of orientation, the short-range achievement of arrival at the fixed and predetermined state. Practice has brought the student to the norm. Sweat has been produced; strength can be measured; the test has been taken; the passing grade is given. The future relation of the student to the program is of minor concern.

In physical education we seek continuous activity independent of the short-range goals of the teacher, so that the individual is prepared, as one might be in the study of literature, for self-perpetuating participation for a lifetime. The goals are long-range. The physical education class in school is seen as only the instructional period preparing the individual to live the kind of a life that will fit into the culture. It is self-perpetuating, whereas physical training is self-defeating. It is not satisfied merely with physical attainments but, on the contrary, seeks the adaptation of the individual at the ethical, esthetic, and behavioral levels as well. If behavior in the social realm is a recognized goal of education, then physical education cannot escape responsibility in this area.

Physical education recognizes that one of the earmarks of an educated person is capacity for decision. The kind of choices one makes in various situations is a measure of one's ability to relate to the culture of the times. Thus, it seeks to teach through discussion, problem solving, example, and analysis those behavioral characteristics that mark the educated person in society.

Applied to the curriculum, physical training consists mostly of unimaginative, repetitive exercises of limited scope and directed mainly toward the production of response to command and physiological well-being. It is the mass exercise of military preparation. It is the marching and countermarching of the

European systems of the 19th century. It consists mainly of a set of activities many of which are extrinsic to the basic purposes of the growing individual and pay a minimal amount of attention to individual variations, needs, and differences.

Physical education, on the other hand, is characterized by a wide variety of activities chosen because they relate to the needs of the growing individual. The individual is recognized as different from all other individuals. Physical education turns the gymnasium and play fields into laboratories where a great variety of activities are taught, most of which we hope are intrinsic to the growing self and whose purpose are for the most part extroverted and not wholly related only to physiological return. It does not confine its activities to the gymnasium but uses the library, the out-of-doors, the discussion group in order to tackle those problems and to learn about those activities the outcomes of which relate to the totality or to the total development of the person.

Now I leave it to you to decide which of the two fits best into your concept of Australian education. I think I know which comes closer to meeting the needs of American youth, although I am not contending that we in our country have happily arrived at such a universal program.

I am fully aware of the fact that when I talk this way about physical education and emphasize the element of thinking that should dominate the response of the student, people are likely to ask, "Whatever do you mean by implying that there can be an element of thinking involved in such an experience?" This is not too difficult a question to answer when you realize the unlimited possibilities and opportunities therein, nor is it too difficult to illustrate the point when you realize that whether you like it or not thinking goes on in the experience. Our problem is largely one of assisting the individual to make the most of the opportunity to think. He *will* think. You can't keep him from it.

It requires thought, for example, to evaluate one's own place in relation to other competitors, to other people, to playmates, and to one's group. It requires thinking to establish value judgments with reference to the ethics of the game. It requires thinking to arrive at some reasonable analysis of one's part in the solution of a strategy problem or to chart a course for a cross-country run or to climb a mountain. It requires thinking to plan logistics for a camping trip or to solve an equipment problem. It requires thinking to write a choreography or to dream up plays to be used in a game. It requires thinking to originate a game, to choose leaders and captains, to solve one's personal problems of security and comfort within a competitive situation. And, of course, as one watches our school or public sports, one does some quiet thinking about the character of human nature while witnessing the behavior of crowds or competitors. There is no dearth of this sort of opportunity. The only questions involved are the

questions of locating the opportunity to assist students in their thinking and to present them with time and opportunity to think the situation through in some kind of intelligent analysis. One can liken the teaching of physical education, therefore, to the teaching of dramatics. One has to develop not only skill in the art but also to analyze and understand something of the meaning and importance.

Were we to be successful in developing the full potential of physical education as an educative experience, we would have no problems with our academic colleagues. We would stand clearly revealed in our own merit and undeniably productive of significant value. But to attain that state, whether in your country or mine, the following developments will have to occur throughout our program:

1. We will have to have professionally prepared personnel. If we are searching for our function, seeking the fullest reason for our being, we have to begin with the functionary. Who is a teacher of physical education? In my country we are slowly eliminating the quack and the mountebank. We are slowly getting people with a university education and advanced degrees. We still have our jolly old swimming coaches who pose as physical education teachers or football coaches who enter the field with no sense of their educational responsibility. We still have quaint people with quaint systems of exercise or impresarios of exercise marts who claim to be the world's greatest physical educators!

I hope you have eliminated these people. If you haven't, you must. The time has passed when physical education can be a haven for washed-up athletes. Neither game skills, varsity medals, nor international athletic reputations are criteria for professional ability in physical education. The emphasis on preparing teachers must switch from athletic experience to a study of human life in its personal and social setting. Then comes a study of the skill of soccer or football or dance or whatever as useful tools from which to choose to get the best results in human development. The activity becomes the instrument contributing its share to desirable transformations in human personality.

An analogy to medicine is appropriate. One does not apply cobalt therapy, even though it is useful, unless the patient requires it. Neither football, nor soccer, nor dance, nor anything else is good unless it is inherently useful and taught in such a way as to contribute to the needs of the individual making use of the activity.

We need standards for the professional preparation of physical education teachers that are no less high than standards for other fields and perhaps higher than most. A four- or five-year preparation in physical education, with its full

complement of study in child development, human biology, educational philosophy and pedagogy, social analysis of the culture of the people, are bases for understanding the uses for and techniques of teaching our enormously large range of activities. These are the tools of our trade, and to master these areas requires a university education, recognized with the usual educational trappings of degrees, honors, and credits. Any other treatment is a remnant of the mythical thinking of a bygone age.

But we, the physical educators of any land, ~~must~~ pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps. No one else will do it for us. The task of weeding out the quack, the uninformed and unprepared, is distinctly ours. People won't take us seriously until we take ourselves seriously enough to develop a solid professional group.

2. We had better quit boring people to death with stupid exercises and activities repeated *ad nauseum* and get down to the business of teaching a program that is intrinsically interesting and that will prepare for lifelong participation. We should make of the physical education period a rich experience—not a dull one—and no more of this clever business of taking boring exercises and dolling them up with music or whistles or funny commands or even prizes or penalties. We have bored people long enough with our ridiculous mystique of "the physical." It is time we made our classes rich with utility, interest, novelty, adventure, and involvement. Our classes should be fun, and they should have an emotional appeal in which the individual becomes involved with his or her own performance and that of others. May the good Lord protect us from these repetitive exercises we make children go through every period in the name of physical fitness, national pride, the President's physical fitness program, Rule Britannia, or whatever!

It is time to realize that a rich experience will lead to other experiences in the same vein. If they like what they learn from us, they will go on to be lifetime participants in something. There are far too many people who find physical education a terminal experience. When they are finally released from the requirement, they give away their sneakers! What a pity! What a pity we did not whet their appetites for further exploration of *something*—fishing, camping, climbing, skiing, boating, anything! A rich experience leads to a lifetime of exhilarating participation, to self-realization, not just as a child, but as an adult, to self-fulfillment, not just as students, but as adults and parents. We are talking, of course, about physical *education*, from which rich experience people learn, become educated. They learn to direct themselves to become self-contained and no longer dependent upon the arrogance of the drill master who counts the cadence and tells us which muscles to stretch and when.

3. Let us vigorously explore some of the new frontiers of physical educa-

tion. The four-minute mile was important, but so is some understanding of the relation of success in motor skills to the catatonic or disturbed child. Is there a controllable therapeutic procedure emerging from the use of the group situation inherent in sport that can be useful in the treatment of psychotic states? Evidence today indicates there is, and the use of an intelligently developed and scientifically applied physical education program in schools and hospitals for the disturbed is a field of rich promise.

Winning the Olympic games is great, and we will spend a few millions making sure our finest athletes do well at Mexico City; but it would also be fun to spend some money on exploring the relation of games to vision. The whole orientation of the blind to the environment can be favorably affected by a type of motor training involving identification of moving parts with the purpose of the expression. Reading skills can be improved as a result of improvement in motor coordination. We need to know more about the relation between active participation and scholastic achievement or what effect experience in dance will have on retarded children.

We know enough about exercise and strength to last us a long time. I wish we knew more about success in sport vis-a-vis juvenile delinquency or social interaction of *any* kind. Will vigorous forced muscular effort favorably affect schizophrenia or the establishment of an appropriate image of self? Will guided experience on the field of play improve social interaction? Let us find out and pay equal attention to something like this as we do to those two very pleasant diversissements for the highly skilled—the Davis Cup and the America's Cup!

4. Let us put "physical fitness" in perspective. What is the role of physical education in health and fitness?

I once wrote, speaking of the United States, that undoubtedly we need a strong populace for either a warm peace or a cold war. To guard the health of the nation is a worthy ambition no matter what our destiny may be. To control disease; to improve nutrition; to prevent mental and nervous diseases; to seek emotional, social, and intellectual stability; and to secure appropriate growth and development of children and youth become almost an abiding national passion. We are committed to such effort—and enthusiastically so. Our form of political life not only requires a nation of healthy citizens but guarantees them the right to be healthy.

So once again programs of physical education are being asked to step up the intensity of their purpose and the vigor of their content in order to save youth, and thus our country, from desuetude if not actual destruction! But we cannot do this by the simple expedient of re-emphasizing an atrociously unscientific but popular term—"physical fitness"—and seek to cure all the ills of the flesh

by the application of a 600-yard run or a series of push-ups. This is what we have been doing. I hope you have not. The result has been a serious loss of prestige for physical education with a corresponding growth in health education, because the latter has recognized the whole range of developmental requirements of young people and has recommended broad programs for their fulfillment.

The need for activity on the part of the human organism has been well established. Documentation is unnecessary. The evidence is clear. The human is an active creature, and activity is important to growth, development, and survival. The need for exercise is here to stay.

But apparently nature does not care a bit how one gets the exercise needed. The form the activity takes is biologically unimportant as long as no harm is done. Run around the block, play football, dance a jig, or climb a telephone pole. The heart does not care. Muscle does not care. The rectus abdominus, which is a pretty important muscle in maintaining visceral order against visceral chaos, does not care whether it is used in basketball, bowling, or burglary, as long as it is used. If muscular strength is what we are after to correct the evil ways into which we have fallen, nature does not care how we get it—or at what price. Strength-building activities can be anything that builds strength, and thus they need have no other purpose, no other meaning, no discernible relation to anything significant except strength itself.

I am afraid this is the sort of thing that some of us are calling "physical" fitness—a sort of muscular development that comes from exercise and that can be used for any purpose at the discretion of the possessor. But scientists, philosophers, educators, and the better informed physical educators have proclaimed that there is more to fitness than muscle strength. A conference of such people in 1956 described fitness as "that state which characterizes the degree to which the person is able to function." It implies the ability of each person to develop most effectively his or her potentialities. And the conference agreed that fitness is maintained at a high level only if motivation is continuously present! This requires an inner desire. The activities that produce fitness must have meaning.

We must make sure that we see such fitness exercises and tests for what they are—usually exercises for strength, spinal flexibility, or endurance—and not assign virtue to them beyond their command. Such exercises do not guarantee values from the realm of the social or moral. The problem is to make the exercise experience an effective instrument of the life of ideas, human relationships, enriching recreations, and rewarding enthusiasms. To allow sport to serve other than socially constructive ends is to ignore the profound educative possibilities in physical experience. The crucial question is not whether we

shall employ the physical but how we are going to use it. The choice is fundamentally never between the physical and the mental but how to acquire an intelligent attitude about each.

I think when all is said and done there are two things that bother me about this physical fitness business. One is that we know there are other factors: nutritional status, the presence or absence of disease, hereditary weaknesses, endocrine misbalances, mental health, and a dozen other psychophysical elements that have as much bearing, if not more, upon this thing we are calling physical fitness as does strength or spinal flexibility. The other is that we seem to be "making hay" out of the popularity of a myth. We are deluding the public when we claim our place in the sun because of our contribution to "physical" fitness, when we have just built our whole reason for being upon the holistic nature of the human. How can we claim fame because of our alleged contribution to "physical" values when we know such fragmentation to be illusory? What are we afraid of? If we cannot make our stand on the basis of the inherent value of our activities to total development, and not just claim refuge in "the physical," we ought to pick up our hockey sticks and go home!

I suppose if we knew more about humans—their biological as well as their psychological nature—we would be less gullible on this fitness business and thus be less liable to misrepresent the field to the others.

And now for a passing salute to our critics or our detractors! When one consults the record of social problems unsolved or looks at the number of school dropouts and other glaring failures of our educational systems, one is amazed at the temerity of our detractors. When one examines human needs and requirements, when one takes the trouble to learn something of the biological and psychological interdependencies and interrelatedness that characterize the human being, one can only be disappointed at the kind of treatment we in physical education receive.

One can only be amused and saddened at the prevalence of this spurious intellectualism that seems to hold that a person's greatest accomplishment is to transcend nature, to rise above it, to free oneself from the restrictions of the physical and biological. To be sure, humans are having great fun and great difficulty relating themselves to nature. The human controls the atom, pollutes the streams, eradicates disease, transplants hearts, levels mountains, and as a result, some gain the impression that the human is something special, something immune to the forces of nature.

But the human is not that at all. A person is but one more living speck upon and within the galaxy of nature's phenomena. The human *is* nature—one particular representation of it and subject then to all the conditions and require-

ments nature establishes for development and survival. Activity—and we represent the active life—is one of those conditions. Surely even the most haughty of our academic critics must, deep down, admit of the place of activity in the total development of any individual.

Any other view of us, of the place of physical education in the development and education of people, is a kind of intellectual anti-intellectualism. It is the informed person not being informed enough. It is the expert not knowing the origin of his or her expertness or the conditions under which expertness is developed.

The intellectual belies intellectualism by displaying an ignorance of human nature through a wish to perpetuate the mind-body dichotomy. There is no surer delusion than to believe that intellect can be developed in the so-called tough academic courses, and those alone, while the “social” and “physical” aspects of youth are deliberately left out of the “academic” curriculum.

Such a position defeats the very purpose of the critic and, if followed to its ultimate conclusion, would bring the whole structure of this spurious intellectualism crashing down in a chaos of frustration, nervous breakdowns, and maladjustments. There is no surer fact in all of life than the dependency of the intellectual processes upon the physical for their functional adequacy or efficiency. Let it be known over and over again that the quality of learning depends upon the quality of the tissue doing the learning, and we in physical education have a great deal to do with the improvement of quality in living tissue. Nor can a student of human life ignore for a minute the inherent contribution of motor or movement experience to the development of wisdom, understanding, awareness, and most of all to self-realization. The human being feeds on something vastly more complex than protein molecules or differential calculus, and if we want the person to survive, we had better provide this required nourishment in both school and home.

We have a great contribution to make to students. I hope you enjoy making it and they enjoy receiving it. Our principal obligation is to the student. We need to help students look inside themselves, to examine their own thoughts and feelings, to help them confront and not evade their own anxiety and loneliness, to treasure the idea and the hope that is theirs alone. The total development of the individual must be the ultimate goal of an education and thus the ultimate goal of each one of us.

Our niche in the educational world may be insecure in spots, but philogenetically it is as sound as a dollar, complete as life itself, baffling in its resistance to evaluation, but of value to students beyond our present understanding. One can only hope that the Lord will help us to deserve the esteem in which we hold ourselves!

Idealism and Its Meaning for Physical Education

The most practical thing a physical educator can use is a philosophy. With it we can evaluate what we are doing against what we are supposed to do. A philosophy gives direction, keeps us on the track, keeps us honest in our endeavors.

Without a philosophy teachers are likely to flounder. They rationalize. They wander from pillar to post choosing activities and using methods that suit their fancy. They are not sure where they are going. They are headless horsemen.

This is not a discourse on the usefulness of philosophy. It is an attempt to illuminate the meaning of one philosophy—idealism—to the practicing physical education teacher. Idealism is a way of understanding that centers on the reality of an idea, the reality of the mind. The idealist believes that all we know about nature comes to us as a thought or idea, and that reality therefore exists in the inner experience of the person.

It began with Socrates and Plato. It receives strength from the Judaic-Christian concept of God. It was amplified by Descartes and Spinoza in the 17th century, and Immanuel Kant in the 18th gave it great force. In America, such thinkers as Emerson, Everett, Mann, Bernard, William T. Harris, Josiah

Delivered to the History and Philosophy Section of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 19, 1961.

Royce, and a great number of 20th-century educators have advanced the cause. Mary Whiton Calkins (1863-1930) does as good a job as any in summarizing the structure of idealism when she holds that the universe is our all-including self and that this self perceives, thinks, feels, and wills. It is a responsible phenomenon and not a creature of an all-dominating nature, submissive always to natural or supernatural forces.

What, then, does this have to do with education in general and physical education in particular? Obviously, and in the first place, any such program of education choosing to relate to idealism will be idea-centered. It will not be centered on the child or the subject matter. The idealist has some notion of what is absolutely good and that it is possible to base a program of education upon the goodness of God. This is idealism in education. Let us see if we can present its meaning to physical education in relation to (a) the learner, (b) the learner's values, (c) the objectives of a program, (d) the curriculum in physical education, and (e) evaluation.

The learner. Idealism cannot condone or support any form of education that conceives of the human being incompletely or inadequately. If we in physical education perceive the human as body only as a biological organism responding only to "natural" forces, then idealism holds we are wholly wrong and shortsighted. The human, to the idealist, is real, but only when the mind and soul are included. The idealist believes that the human is related to an order of things broader than the biological, that intelligence and reasoning relate to God, and therefore if we in physical education wish to do the greatest good for the individual we will treat the person as something besides protoplasm to be molded and stretched and made flexible and "physically fit." The idealist challenges us in physical education to teach moral and spiritual values. The idealist believes that the "body" is merely the physical expression of the nature of the soul, and thus our concept (in physical education) of "build," strength, physical fitness, symmetry, performance, posture, contour, and such are meaningful and important only when it is understood that they are of no significance of and by themselves. They are not ends. They are to be developed not for their own sake. *In fact, any development of them at all is contingent upon the purpose and direction of their use.* They must contribute to spiritual ends. This makes many of our slogans and shibboleths empty words indeed!

As H. H. Horne says, "Education must abandon the theory that the mind is an isolated entity caught in this mundane sphere and detained in the body as its prison house, in the favor of the theory that mind and body together constitute one organic unity."¹ There is nothing new in that, but I suggest *it is the most powerful concept* ever to bear upon what we do in physical education. It traps us completely. It holds us firmly by our holistic throat and denies us forever the doubtful privilege of not caring what happens to our charges as long as they

grow strong or perform well. It slams the door forever on the cult of muscle.

Self is a multiplicity but a unity nevertheless, and the sum of the parts is less than the whole because there is a quality to the whole that does not reside in any part. If these things are true then nothing we can do in physical education may be judged by less than its effect upon the spirit of humans. We had better watch our step when we enthusiastically back a massive program seeking physical values without intelligently gearing these values into spiritually and morally acceptable behavior.

Values. Idealism holds two values rooted in existence: persons and the moral imperative. Children are persons; players are persons; students are persons. They are minds, personalities, souls. They are ends. They are not means.

Our students and our players are not chattel for exploitation, not tools to be used to further *our* ego or reputation, not people to be shoved around, ordered, whistled at, booed, ridiculed, scolded for reasons of ours and not theirs. The exploitation of school and college athletes of today for ends not theirs would make the great Kant shudder in his grave, because it was he who challenged us to "act so that in your own person as well as in the person of every other you are treating mankind also as an end, never merely as a means."

Let proponents of post-season Bowl games, all-star games, state tournaments beware of this philosophical indictment. If all selfishly ambitious coaches and sadistic "gym teachers" were judged by this point of view they would vanish in the turgid atmosphere of their self-generated hot air!

The idealist recognizes evil not as self-subsistent but as a necessary possibility in a world where individuals have the freedom to realize the good. If the good is centered in the spiritual self and the individual is the ultimate moral value, then anything we promote in physical education adverse to human interests is immoral. The lust for money, for status, for victory at the cost of welfare; expressions of anger; the casual approach to violence (as Norman Cousins would have it)—these manifestations are evil because they deplete the self.

Idealism holds that the moral imperative to do good is a part of the nature of humanity. Humans may be confused, while they are young, as to just what "good" is. Children may not know what "fair play" means. They have to be taught. But if they are taught, the idealist holds they will readily respond. For to do good, to avoid oppression, to teach fair play, to cultivate respect for others, to conduct our contests on a high level of sincerity and integrity is to obey the moral law.

Objectives. As our own Educational Policies Commission put it a few years back, if the supreme moral value in education is man himself, then objectives in physical education tumble into place rather easily. Their enumeration would clearly distinguish between means and ends. Strength and body development would not become objectives. They would become only means of aiding the student to capture a realization of truth, beauty, and goodness. The spiritual ideals of the race are the true objectives, and to attain them should command the energies of all teachers. As President Bixler of Colby states it, the basic purpose of education "is to help the learner distinguish the good and beautiful from the cheap and the shoddy." Where in the day-by-day conduct of physical education do we find tangible effort to accomplish this?

Actually, as measured by this idealistic philosophy, our programs from top to bottom would profit enormously if we were to strengthen them in these respects. We confuse means with objectives, fall short of true goals, become satisfied with scores instead of character, and stumble aimlessly along muttering something about health for health's sake and the game for the game's sake. We beam prettily when we test a million children with a dynamometer but fail to construct a solid program of total development to orient the test scores through some kind of relation to things that are really important.

Curriculum. The implications of idealism for the curriculum are endless. We have neither the time nor the space to mention them all. I shudder to think what would happen to some of our hard-headed traditionalists if we ever took this philosophy seriously.

In the first place, because idealism sees society not as a collection of individuals but as an organism in which individuals participate, it would endorse enthusiastically student participation in the planning of curriculums! Teachers and students would work things out together.

In the second place, although idealism emphatically insists upon the freedom for self-determination, it insists that such self-determination take place within a matrix of social concern, with society providing the medium for nurture and development. If this means to look with skepticism upon some of our individual activities that turn an individual inward, provide little or no experience with the interplay of social involvement, teach one to be a stuffy egoist, then perhaps these activities can be played down and some of them eliminated in our curriculum. Weight lifters please note!

But mainly, I suppose, the idealist—being a skeptic at heart—would not accept any curriculum or activity just because it had been used for a thousand years or because somebody wrote about it in the *Journal*. Weight-lifting for girls, obstacle courses, free-hand calisthenics, marching, anything traditional

or bizarre is looked at with a fishy eye and must be justified in the curriculum in terms not of sweat, usage, or history, but in relation to the idealistic objectives already stated. The idealist is not an eclectic; the idealist abhors both mines-trone and borscht!

The idealist would surely make room in the curriculum for the teaching of social, moral, and spiritual values, and leave them neither to chance nor imitation. The idealist believes that the teacher must be worthy of imitation, but because it is so much easier to be evil than good the idealist would have us make room in our curriculum for discussion, analysis, and decision making in the area of sportsmanship, ethical choice, and moral behavior.

And the idealist would throw into limbo any teacher of physical education who usurped from the players the right to think. Perhaps this is method, but it may also be curriculum. Modern big-time football to a full-blown idealist must appear ridiculous! As Donald Butler says in *Four Philosophies* (1957), "Since it is the self-activity of the pupil in which genuine education and development take place, he wants the student to be confronted by decision and selection as much of the time as is practicable. Certainly, he does not want the pupil's will crippled by having his decisions and selection made for him." ² Signals from the bench in baseball and football and those intensive huddles in basketball where the "mastermind" masterminds too frequently place decisions in the wrong hands.

But activities encouraging creative expression, problem solving, and effort expended because something is inherently interesting and challenging—these would receive the blessing of the idealist. The idealist would encourage discussion of provocative questions, resolution of alternatives as the basis for behavior, and the use of questions not so much to find what the student thinks as to cultivate the student's judgment.

Evaluation. The principal outcome cherished by the idealist in evaluating a physical education program would be the development of self-propelled continuous activity when school is over. Idealism says that learning takes place within the self of the learner. This is not very different from the doctrine of pragmatism. Both would reject performance in physical education that is merely the result of command. Idealism would measure the outcomes in physical education by the amount of self-education developed and used, not merely by changes in the behavioral process but by changes all the way through the self involving conviction and reflection on meaning and value. The idealist would not be happy with any evaluation that merely showed statistical results. The score is not a true measure of success, nor are data showing the number who "came out" for intramurals. The fact of a million children having been tested for something is less than meaningful; it actually would arouse suspicion

about the educative validity of the enterprise. The idealist's measures are not quantitative. The idealist waits to see what changes are made in the self.

And that, in essence, is the key to idealism. Self-activity leading to self-development involving the total self is to the idealist the important thing. Physical education falls well within this philosophical concept as it applies to education because of its obvious and very significant potential as a strong contributor toward understanding of self.

NOTES

1. H. H. Horne, *The Philosophy of Education*, rev. ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1930), p. 37.
2. J. Donald Butler, *Four Philosophies*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1957); p. 259.

The Relation of Principles to Practice

Physical education, like any other essentially activity curriculum, needs a carefully drawn set of principles as guides to its development. Without them there is danger of losing sight of what the activities are for. There is danger of picking the activities without much concern for their bearing upon the student. Without using principles as a guide one relies upon pragmatic experience, and "it works" becomes the criterion for selection of content and for administrative practice.

But the wise person in physical education knows that almost anything will "work." Success is not always justification for use. In a field heavily weighted with administration or "practical" matters, the temptation is real indeed to judge any curriculum or any practice by its workability rather than by its purposes or its effects.

For many years the teaching of physical education required little thought or planning. Little else was necessary than to step in front of the class, blow the whistle, and start giving commands. That kind of a teacher could be prepared in a year. He needed only a good voice and a bag of tricks.

But in the 20th century people ask certain questions—not only of education

Published in the textbook *Physical Education*, revised edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.

in general but of physical education in particular. What are the purposes of these activities? What is the student thinking about? Does he learn anything? What does physical education have to do with cultural values? These and a host of other questions require answers. Physical education has to look inward to see where it stands. It realizes that its routine practices need justification in educational terms or they must be abandoned. They must be examined critically to determine their purpose, and their purpose must jibe with man's nature and his social goals. Moreover, the program must be rooted in the same soil as the best in all of education.

This view requires the formulation of purposes, of principles, of theory. It forces the physical education teacher to look at any activity critically in terms of its effect upon the total development of the student, and then, if the criteria in theory or principle are met, to teach the activity so as to attain the expected outcomes.

There should be no confusion about the relation of principle to practice. No activity is valuable, none can be trusted, until its purpose can be established. No program can be recognized as good until the principles upon which it is based are known. Practice without principle is a headless horseman. The practical person who scoffs at theory knows not where he is going or why. He merely teaches to occupy the hour and lacks the vision to see potential directions. The theoretician, or the one motivated and guided by principle, will always be the master because theory has always been the guide, the forerunner. Theory is the force, the genesis, of most of the world's planned development. Occasionally, to be sure, someone stumbles onto a way of doing something, on an invention or a discovery, without knowing why or how he did it. But for the most part developments in science, industry, or education proceed in some planned manner leading from a hypothesis or theory whose implications are being explored. The theoretical physicist has been the guiding spirit underlying the portentous recent developments in explosives. It was to test a theory that most of our immunizations were produced. Washington and Jefferson and Hamilton gave voice to broad generalizations and basic principles which found practical expression in laws. The steam engine and the rocket ship existed first "on paper," in the mind of a theorist who later guided the hands of "practical" people as they worked out the idea. To operate from a theory or a principle is the way of intelligence.

Physical education has suffered from too much "practical" reasoning and not enough response to thought and principle. Its history in our schools is littered with the mistakes of those practical people who have turned their backs on progressive developments and who have been content with doing something year after year merely because "it works." Usually, when one hears the veteran teacher say, "Well, that sounds all right in theory, but it won't work in practice," one can wager that he has only half-heartedly tried to make it work in

practice. The proof of the validity of a theory may not be had until something *does* work in practice, but the chances are that that frustrated old-timer is really trying to say, "Don't bother me with any new ideas. I'm too comfortable the way I am." Only yesterday, some older teacher said to a younger one, "Your theories are fine but they won't work under today's conditions." That is being said over and over in spite of the fact that young teachers with enthusiasm and imagination are making their theories work time after time.

Particularly vicious, however, is the type of thinking which permits one to hold on to a practice after all the logic, all the reasoning, point to it as in distinct violation of good theory and principle. The exploiters of schoolboy and school-girl athletes, for example, care little for fact or principle. These athletic racketeers will overdevelop football, not in the best interests of boys, but for their own glory and vain satisfactions. Community boxing tournaments are still scheduled in spite of all the evidence to show how harmful, even murderous, boxing is. The gloves are not golden but the advertising value is. The boys who batter themselves into insensibility do so to provide sadistic thrills for spectators and a smug satisfaction for the sponsors. The latter can tell of the good they do in the field of public recreation! Practical, indeed, but devastating to human tissue!

Or perhaps it is the coach who schedules 32 basketball games a season, or a dozen or more football games, or who pits the undermanned squad against the Big Team just to make some money. Of all the parts of the broad field of physical education which have magnificent possibilities for good, the field of schoolboy competitive athletics needs most of all the courageous administration of high-principled men and women who know what they are doing and can tell you why. And yet, too frequently physical education is judged in the eyes of both the public and the educator by the activities of the professionally unprepared spokesman who administers a program not by planned, thoughtful, and rational action but by the rule of expedience and experience. That situation is comparable to gaining an impression of the area of psychology by believing the words or admiring the practice of some phrenologist. Or of judging medicine by the standards of chiropractors or witch doctors. Physical education cannot fairly be judged by the activities of the small group of unprincipled fakers who advocate some exercise or other or who conduct athletic programs for commercial rather than educational ends.

The ideal would be to conduct all the various aspects of a complete program according to principle. Within such a program nothing would be done solely for expedient, practical, or popular reasons. It would first have to meet the test of its relationship to a sound principle. "I agree with you in principle" would become a commitment to find the practical answer which would exemplify the basic purpose involved.

The modern physical educator is obligated to develop from the study of the nature of the needs of man a set of principles or theories which, when cultivated in practice, will produce the ideal type of program. That is the invitation to the young teacher of today.

Did the men of De Soto and Balboa and Champlain, as they roamed the forests of continental North America in the 16th and early 17th centuries, play any games, or sing any songs, or dance any dances? Did the colonials at Jamestown and Plymouth Rock and Barnstable bowl on the green or do their version of the Virginia reel? Very likely they did. Very likely the early exploring parties as well as the permanent settlers brought along as part of their way of living some games and sports better to express themselves and to add to the enjoyment of living. From that meager beginning, from the occasional wood-chopping or corn-planting "match" of the New England farmer, from the thin trickle of country dances allowed by the pious fathers, there came the torrent of more vigorous sports of a more leisurely populace in the 19th century. Bowling and baseball, football and basketball, winter sports and tennis and golf, took hold and children began seriously to learn to play. Now in the 20th century the student of cultural anthropology has to reckon with our devotion to games, to dance in all its forms, and to sports which currently command the attention of millions of Americans.

One cannot help but ask why. Why do millions of children play marbles or jump rope every spring? Why do millions of boys take to basketball every winter with an enormous zest? What is this force? What can be done with this phenomenon? The student of physical education wants to perpetuate it. He wants the oncoming generations to learn the same recreational pleasures. He sees their value to individual development. But he also sees within them something more. He sees how they may be used to affect the character of society. He sees them as an educational medium in which there is an interaction between the individual and his group. Not only does the young girl or boy "come into increasing possession of himself and his powers" through these experiences, but the character of his expressions within the activities shapes the kind of society in which he lives. His education then—that is, his physical education—relates to the quality of these experiences and extends our conception of education beyond the passive acquisition of knowledge about his world. He becomes a participant *within* the world, and his teacher becomes his guide and counselor as they seek to control the quality of the experiences.

When the modern physical education teacher reads of Dewey's belief that "all education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the race,"¹ he recognizes the play situation as immensely laden with social implications. He thus is convinced that he must somehow organize and control the situations to produce acceptable educational results.

He is further impressed when he ponders the meaning of Dewey's comment that "the only true education comes through the stimulation of the child's powers by the demands of the social situations in which he finds himself." ²

Such statements give him a clue to the location of principles. He seeks their origin and he knows where to look. He must analyze life the way man lives it, which means he must analyze (a) the way man constructs his society and (b) man's own nature. If he can derive facts from these analyses, he can construct principles; and if he can construct principles, he can operate a directed program because he will know what he is doing and why.

An analysis of the social structure (i.e., social, political, economic, ideological) of a community or nation will give important leads as to the kind of physical education which will serve the purposes of the people. In a democratic society one would expect physical education to be conducted democratically. In a regimented society one would use physical education to further the regimentation. In a nation geared constantly to war there would be a strong resemblance between physical education and military preparation. In this volume we have been speaking of a physical education geared to the peaceful pursuits of a democratic society, and hence, to review, we find some of the following characteristics available for translation into principles for physical education:

1. *Equality of opportunity is sought.* The Declaration of Independence proclaimed that. It declared all men were created equal, meaning equal in their title to opportunity—to educational opportunity. Physical education responds by establishing the principle of equality in the program, by opening its facilities to all, by providing instruction for all. It responds by recognizing the dabbler as well as the star, girls as well as boys, by helping each to seek his avenue of expression, excluding no one, giving excellence its due but sacrificing no right of the poorer in ability to extend the competence of the already superior. It disavows special privilege, seeks to "give every man his chance," and reduces the playground bully to a stature commensurate with the others. The great documents of the nation proclaim such equality as the "veritable fact of the days in which we live," and thus physical education can only be subversive if it denies by its administration or teaching the right of all to an equality of opportunity.

2. *Democracy promotes the general welfare.* The general welfare places individuals above institutions. "There can be no such thing as the welfare of 'the state' at the expense of, or in contrast with, the general welfare of the individuals who compose it. Man is not made for institutions. Institutions are made by and for mankind." ³ Physical education responds by adapting the program to the individual insofar as it possibly can. It seeks the individual's welfare. It creates a program suited to him and does not ask him to sacrifice his

best interests for the good of the program. It believes in "team spirit" and "team loyalty" only as long as such a miniature "state" does not require performance at the expense of his general welfare.

3. *People prefer individual enterprise to regimentation.* Other forms of government are distinguished from democracy by their reliance upon force, upon regimentation, upon the response of people to the commands of the rulers. Democratic people prefer to govern themselves, order their own lives, and enjoy creative self-expression. Physical education responds by rejecting the response-command type of activity, by seeking spontaneity and student initiative. The teacher becomes the guide, not the drillmaster. Mass exercises and blind indoctrination both disappear, and proposal, discussion, and popular decision become the vogue.

4. *This democracy pursues happiness.* The Declaration also proclaimed that. It gave to the individual the right of pursuit of happiness and thus placed its attainment high on the scale by which we "judge the effectiveness of social life." Such happiness "is that abiding contentment that comes from a complete and abundant life, even though such a life includes, as all lives must, both success and failure, prosperity and adversity, sunshine and shadow, cradle songs and funeral hymns. To be happy, we must know the realities of life, whatever they may be. We must be able to understand relative values in the midst of confusion, to seek the deeper meanings beyond the shallow, to desire worthwhile achievement in the midst of much that is trivial." 4

Physical education responds by conducting a program where such elemental satisfactions may be had, where success and acclaim are more dominant than frustration and anonymity. Physical education believes in providing opportunity for each to achieve success according to his lights and through his own efforts to attain happiness. It seeks joy, fun, contentment, pleasure. It hopes to avoid those situations which provoke anger, resentment, or sorrow. Its games thus should be conducted in an atmosphere of friendly rivalry in which the values derived are from the game and not from the anguish of the defeated opponent. Physical education seeks to bring to all a large measure of basic happiness by providing rewarding skills in activities which are meaningful to the individual.

5. *Twentieth-century America tends to place human values above the material.* The days of the great land grabs, the exploitation of natural resources, and the sacrifice of human values—in fact, human beings—to the attainment of wealth have passed. Our social institutions now seek ways of conserving not only the natural resources but human resources as well. Human values are now important. People cling to religious concepts. They educate for character. They pride themselves upon seeking no territorial aggrandizement through war.

They seek only that free people may live in peace. To enrich, preserve, and prolong human life has become an important goal of our society.

Physical education responds by studying what the "average man" seeks. It knows he wants something satisfying, something to cheer for, to brag about a little, to take pride in. Physical education recognizes that he wants to be a little bit different from the rest, a little bit distinguished. So it teaches him a wide variety of activities, hoping he can become distinguished in one or more of them. It knows he abhors the monotony of health "exercises." He does not want health that badly. He is one not to be content with a miserable *status quo*—with boredom, or poverty. He seeks the good life, and if a tennis court figures in his calculations he is likely to get it. The physical educator knows that books were written *after* man learned to read, so he teaches people to play tennis, knowing that the provision of the court will very likely follow.

Modern physical education values more the good which comes to the competitor than the size and value of "the gate." It dislikes exploitation. It disapproves of using children for ends other than their own. It prizes human welfare over commercial advantage or the inflated ego of the promoter or alumnus. In so prizing it comes closer to the basic purposes of the democratic way of life.

6. *Respect for personality is the central social theme of the democratic way.* If the concept of democracy involves a cluster of ideals, then education becomes the principal effort to "actualize the social ideals into human behavior." ⁵ People must be taught to act in reference to each other with the respect born out of a high appreciation of the value of human life. Physical education responds by believing that above all other values, above the victory, above strength, above skill, the quality of the interpersonal experience is paramount. All else is secondary. The principal aim, the prior objective, is to teach people to get along with each other in mutual respect. Only thus can physical education most closely be related to the central theme, the chief ingredient of the democratic way.

7. *Our culture prizes its freedom.* Our colonists came to North America to find freedom. They knew what they wanted. They wanted freedom of choice, freedom to come and go, free boundaries, free schools, free speech, and freedom of religion. These were compelling things. And in the years since colonial times the people have fought bitter military and legislative battles to preserve these freedoms.

Physical education has responded by realizing that without choice there can be little freedom. To be free to choose requires a knowledge and experience of things to choose from. And as J. B. Nash says:

In order to choose, a man must be able to distinguish between good, better, and best or that which is helpful as against that which is hurtful, and must have had a wide play and recreational experience gathered from such fields as art, crafts, nature exploration, music, drama, literature, and sports and games. There is but a narrow range of choice if his diet has consisted of little but the radio, television and movie thrillers where he sits on the side lines and does not participate.⁶

This is a compelling reason why a physical education program must be broad rather than narrow, varied rather than monotonous. The student consumer is entitled to sufficient experience to give the base for choice. There is no *one* sport, no one game, no one activity which is good for everyone. One cannot enjoy freedom if one is not free to choose from among many.

These are but seven examples of social tenets which lie at the root of a modern program. There are many others.

Physical education, as a part of the general educational pattern in America, enjoys local autonomy. There is no national program. There is no federal Ministry of Education which prescribes the kind of physical education that shall be taught in our communities. This local autonomy is a principle derived from the original colonial conception of states' rights. It was provided in the Constitution that the several states shall provide their own educational program without interference or direction from the federal government. The principle has remained intact for over a century, and states have successfully resisted, through the Congress, any effort to vest the control of education in the central government. States have developed their own programs, established their own minimum standards, financed their own schools.

To physical education such a principle means that, above the minimum limits established by his state, every physical education teacher has the responsibility of developing his own program subject only to the direction and approval of the local school officials. A teacher thus must have initiative, resourcefulness, and ability to create and administer. The responsibility and authority are largely local. No one will tell him what to do. He may pick and choose. It becomes essential, therefore, that he be a competent student of his field, able to weigh values, to study needs, and to meet needs with an appropriate program.

Occasionally, the complexion of local politics affects physical education. Changes in party government, emphases in economy, social attitudes, variations in the interpretation of the so-called welfare state, will modify its programs in some places. The teacher will be familiar with such local conditions and will build a program in accordance with the strength of the local wishes. No principle is involved particularly except perhaps that of expediency, which

frequently affects adversely a strong adherence to more fundamental social and political points of view.

Principles arise from an analysis of the working conditions under which the population lives. If leisure is on the increase, physical education moves to meet the need for its constructive use. Physical education tries to equip its students with worthwhile and interesting activities that can contribute to the enjoyment of leisure. If technology lessens the need for manual labor, physical education responds by developing vigorous sports and other activities in its program and by teaching its students the necessity of compensating for the inactivity forced upon them by the industrialized society.

If the labor movement seeks certain advantages to union members through recreation at the plant or in the community, physical education attempts to teach the young how best to enjoy the facilities once they become eligible for them.

It is patently not enough that man's society be analyzed to discover something about physical education. Man's nature must be looked at also. The facts of his unity, of his growth and development, of the way he reacts and learns—these are basic. If one were to assay the relative importance of the two sets of facts, i.e., from his society and from his nature, one would recognize the stalemate argument between heredity and environment. Man cannot achieve anything socially unless his original nature permits him to. The genetic strain is a limiting factor. It sets upper limits. The quality of tissue which composes any given individual determines his maximum achievement. Education cannot prepare for any form of society unless the organic and psychological potentialities are there which will make for its attainment.

Thus physical education must know man and be guided by his nature. It will be worthwhile to review briefly some of the elements to illustrate how principles grow out of the facts of man's life:

1. *The human animal is intended to be an integrated whole.* The forces of disease, worry, the sedentary life, and others may lead him toward disintegration, but basically he strives toward the harmonious functioning of all his powers each in relation to the other and all in relation to the whole. Physical education responds to this by teaching activities which occupy the whole of man, rather than those which segment him. Totally developmental activities are preferred to those which deal only with muscle or with body areas.

2. *The increase in size and height, the growth of the vital systems, can be studied and the predicted rates and states known at any given time in a child's life.* Measures of growth are available. Some things are possible at certain growth stages which are not possible at others.

Physical education responds by adapting its program to those growth stages. It hopes not to ask too much of its students, nor does it want to lag behind with activities insufficiently stimulating for the growth needs.

3. *Muscular development is indispensable to the welfare of the total organism.* Physical education responds by developing the principle of central muscular involvement (as opposed to peripheral), of large muscle activity. The program then emphasizes free-swinging, free-moving games and dances which must of necessity be developmental in the abdominal area.

4. *Boys and girls differ in their physiology, their rates of maturation, their anatomy.* Physical education applies what it knows not only of individual differences but of the differences between the sexes and produces two similar but nevertheless different programs. The practice is geared to the principle of difference which is derived from the facts.

5. *The organism is expendable.* Tissue gives out. It may be attacked and destroyed. Conversely, it heals. It repairs itself. Physical education knows of these processes and tries only to facilitate, never to interfere; only to develop, never to tear down. Knowing disease processes, the intelligent teacher would never ask for participation during disease. Knowing metabolism, the teacher would give ample time for repair of fatigue.

6. *Individuals vary from one another and within themselves from time to time in heart size and power.* The heart can be damaged. Conditions should be favorable for its growth. Activity can antagonize the heart when it has been previously damaged. The program must be adjusted individually to compensate for heart variations.

7. *The new interpretations of perception have an obvious bearing upon learning motor skills.* Teaching must be done in the light of the facts. The mark of the antiquarian is his failure to use such newer knowledge when it can be applied.

8. *Man can learn best when he learns all over.* The sense of motion, of knowing where one is in space, of feeling muscularly the thing being experienced, is basic to all animal life. The physical education teacher studies these relationships and knows that an intellectual appreciation of a sport is a poor imitation at best of the real understanding of it which can only be gained by taking part in it. That is why he prefers activity to discussion, participation to watching. He also understands how possible it is to learn more of art, for example, by painting or drawing, more of literature by trying to write, more of games by playing them. The program deals with this sort of learning. It is total learning.

9. *A study of the nervous system indicates how important it is to the vital systems to have consciousness diverted from them.* Physical education responds by developing a program which endeavors to fix attention on an objective rather than upon form, to aid in substituting an object-consciousness for a self-consciousness. The program seeks to avoid the self-adulation of some activities and substitute a selflessness more likely to be derived from others.

10. *Common causes of disintegration of the personality are known.* The program of physical education seeks to substitute status and security for frustration and rejection. It seeks to control the play situation so that it can be sure of the relation of the participant to others within it. The program is concerned about those who participate. The outcomes in personal development are significantly more important than those on the scoreboard or on the balance sheet.

There are scores of other such elements from analyses of the nature of man's make-up. The way one learns, the role played by interest, the desirability of accurately appraising oneself, the facts about muscle warm-up, of digestion—these and other elements are all of sufficient importance to modify a program of physical education.

And thus, physical education analyzes the cut of man's culture, his society, his nature, the conditions under which he lives. The teacher realizes that he must answer these needs, must contribute to appreciation of fine living, of beauty, of happiness. The program will die unless it bears a recognizable identity not only to the deeper purposes and directions of man's society but also to nature and to his basic capacities.

Principles of physical education are thus derived from the way people want to live—and programs which express these principles affect the continuation or alteration of these social patterns.

NOTES

1. John Dewey, *My Pedagogic Creed* (Washington, DC: National Education Association), p. 6.
2. Ibid.
3. Educational Policies Commission, *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy* (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1938), p. 17.
4. Ibid.
5. John Dewey.
6. Jay B. Nash, *Philosophy of Recreation and Leisure* (St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Co., 1953), p. 37.

A Decalogue of Principles

John Dewey once said that no program of education could survive in a democracy except that it draws its life from the people. There is no merit in advocating any program or point of view unless it stems from the discernible facts of man's life or his society. The empirical, preconceived, and biased notions of one who argues without his facts Dewey relegates to the mumbo-jumbo of superstition and rationalization. To advocate something because it is old, or has been used before, or merely on the say-so of the pundit is a form of influence hardly fitting in our educational planning of today.

In physical education there have turned up some notable instances of violations of Dewey's premise. We generally give what meager credit is due, for example, to Jahn, one of the early 19th century fascists of Europe, for using physical education most effectively as a device for the creation of a nationalism that was neither based on the facts of man's organic function nor in keeping with the best of his social and psychological possibilities. How successful he was can only be judged in our time by the repeated wars we have had with the products of his ideology.

Other such usurpers of the rights of people have come and gone. Most of

Delivered on the occasion of the retirement of Blanche M. Trilling as director of physical education for women at the University of Wisconsin, May 1946. Published in *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 18:4-5, 50-54; January, 1947.

them have gone, although contemporary physical education, like contemporary education, shows the marks of their abuses. Today's struggle to determine what shall be the nature of a modern education is unfortunately as much an effort to throw off the old influences as it is to create something new and more closely fitting the American scene.

Today's professional group of teachers are the beneficiaries of hard, patient, and productive work on the part of those who have lived in this half century. As a result of this work we have seen an American program of physical education evolve to the point where we can see its outlines. We can recognize its shape through the fog of tradition. What we are doing today in physical education is the outcome, the product of this analysis of American life by those who have forced us all to look at American people as our only source of what is good in our educational institutions.

In the first half of this century we resisted many varied attempts to capture physical education and make of it something which would have died in the last half. Many have been the flamboyant schemes to perpetrate a national physical culture bereft of anything but physical outcomes. We might have been overwhelmed with an athletic aristocracy which honored only the perfect performance of the highly skilled—and all male, at that. We haven't much of that today. When impressive Nils Bukh came over and taught Danish gymnastics many rushed to imitate. We might have modeled our programs after many another off-shore influence because there have been dozens of them trying to capture our imagination. We have been urged to take up jai-lai and marching, red drills and white, high bars and low bars, free hand and heavy, this system and that, and we have received them all, forgotten most, and moved on seeking only the activity, the method, and the outcome which must, as Dewey foretold, jibe with the things we as a people are and want to be.

But now we are emerging from our formative years. The early work of the great men and women of our field was passed on to strong minds and sure hands. It is timely to say that we are at last growing up, still somewhat adolescent in thought and practice, to be sure; but the writer feels that our professional fiascos of this last great war, born out of our immaturity, are among our last, and that henceforward we will mature to the point where we will know what physical education in American schools is—should be and can be.

For with us, as with all other professions, principle has been slow to evolve but once established has dominated practice. Our principles have been a century in the making. The discovery of the facts of man's organic life, of his psychological behaviors, and of his social nature has been a slow and continuing process, basic to the establishment of principles. The revelations of the facts

of man's life, the formulation of principles based upon them, the establishment of objectives as outgrowths of principles and the development of practice to attain the objectives—that has been our pattern of growth. All other patterns have died of their own unsoundness.

These principles then have set the stage for the future of physical education in our land. May we phrase a decalogue of them and cite them one by one as characteristic of American physical education today?

FIRST: That American physical education must be in the image of the American democracy, must be rooted in the culture of American people, and must have no values different from those conducive to life in the republic.

We no longer can tolerate a physical education for the few. We cannot rest until there is to be seen in every program in the country an equality of opportunity for all, for girls as well as boys, for the skilled as well as the dumb, for the handicapped as well as the normal, each to seek and find his appropriate physical education. For rich and poor, and for all races and creeds we must follow the great beliefs of all education and bring to everyone the facilities, time, and instruction to participate in the great heritage of dance and sport, games and athletics. People everywhere, on the farm and in the factory, in the cities and in rural areas, must feel the impact of our work.

SECOND: That the practice of physical education must forever acknowledge the known and proven fact about the human organism.

We have resisted quackery before and we must continue to do so. The false claims for exercise, the spurious training processes, the legend of deep breathing exercises, the misplaced emphases upon muscle development, and the panaceas for health—these and others fade away under the bright light of fact. In their place has come a rational program of developmental activity, suited to age and sex, to condition and need, and taught well by people who know the possibilities and limitations of human life.

THIRD: That in all of physical education there is but one set of purposes, one standard of values, and one criterion for measuring the worth of practice—the good of the individual.

No other standard is acceptable in democratic education. We sacrifice the individual, exploit him, use him as a means rather than as an end only in time of war. In peace his right to development, to self-expression, to self-direction, and his responsibility for self-control are paramount. We can sacrifice no player for the sake of the team or for the glory of the coach. Glory in victory must be enjoyed to the fullest only if it is earned not at the expense of the individual.

We cannot use commercial value, or expediency, or selfish purpose as

criteria to judge the worth of an activity or of the relation of an individual to it. We must put in first place the welfare of the American girl and boy and accept no values but those which reflect their best interests.

FOURTH: That physical education contains within it a great potential for learning, for the cultivation of reflective thinking, and for the intellectualization of our choices.

There are some who say there is no thinking in physical education. They believe it is "entirely physical," that no thought is needed. Others say that our form of education is really training, the establishment of fixed habit. And so at one time it might have been. There is little of problem solving, of the search for experimental application of suggested answers, and the recognition of consequences in the learning of the pirouette or the giant swing. Little intellectualizing goes on in marching and calisthenics. Such are reflexive stunts rather than reflective acts. So also is the training given in many high-pressure sports of today. The coach does all the thinking, solves all the problems, and requires a performance quite within the category of a fixed habit. But actually a physical education means teaching the skills and behaviors within activities so as to allow for student participation in the planning, in the decision. It requires the anticipation of situations involving choice and the hope for the development of a flexible habit that gives the learner the means of solving the problems as he meets them in his constantly changing world. Opportunities are unlimited in physical education for learning and for reflective thinking. The richness to be derived from teaching in physical education is not in the sheer fact of performance but in the quality of the thinking that produced the performance, either good or bad.

FIFTH: That the teaching of values on the ethical-moral plane must assuredly be as definite and planned for as those of skill.

We deal with individuals. As adults, we begin teaching individuals when they are infants. The first things taught are individual behavior patterns. Eventually, we want courage, unselfishness, and a fine sense of honor. No child can grasp any such abstractions except that he form them from a constellation of specific acts or behaviors. Learning to be a "good sport" begins when he walked away from the swing in a huff because someone else got there first. Learning about cooperation might well have begun on the ball diamond when he learned "not to be a pig about his turn at bat." We need to reduce the learning about this code of ethics of ours, these complicated moral values, to teachable elements. We need to isolate them, see them, teach them, and evaluate their development as surely as we measure speed in swimming or the length of a jump. Physical education cannot dodge its responsibility for the cultivation of its rich potentialities in this area of personal conduct.

SIXTH: That physical education is as much a social science as a biological one because its outcomes are measurable in terms of group behaviors as well as organic enrichment.

In a democracy we learn to operate in groups. We express ourselves, test our expression against that of others, then go along if necessary with the opposition for the good of the whole. We were not born with such talent. We have to learn it. In physical education we know all about such group action. The team, the club, the room, the class—those are the units with which we work. To learn how to help in the adjustment of the individual to the cross-currents of other personalities within the group is one of our privileges. We must develop the social competencies within our students. Students can be taught within the group that greatest of all lessons within a democracy—respect for personality. They can be helped to avoid the unsocial behaviors of selfishness or bigotry, and we can claim distinction in this field only when we know as much about how to assure a social acceptance as we now know how to teach the forehand drive. Physical fitness is not enough, nor are coordination and skill. These three must not be allowed to monopolize our efforts as we strive for outcomes. Physical education is irrevocably a multiple-outcome experience, and our methods must be so devised as to secure them.

SEVENTH: That the activities and methods producing an objective extroverted flow of consciousness are more to be desired than those which turn the individual upon himself toward an introverted development.

This principle, based as it is upon the well-known facts of the psychosomatic relationships, sounds the death knell for body-building, body-worship, and self-adulation. It explains the unhappy fate of weight-lifting, the ballet, and too much form in anything. It explains why golf to many is such a confusing mass of frustrations in which the player, desperately striving to remember his knee, elbow, and chin, flukes his shot through self-consciousness as surely as the speaker complains of gastric butterflies when he worries more about the impression he will make than about what he has to say. The exhibitionist, the poseur, may be products of this method, and our selections of activities and our methods of teaching can avoid these outcomes frequently by directing the flow of consciousness outward—on the ball, the mountain, the choreography, or the welfare of the opponent. We in physical education have a responsibility, shared with other influences, to be sure, for producing the more productive, socially useful personality.

EIGHTH: That physical education, far from being an isolated and quite foreign element within the curriculum of American education contains within it elements quite identical with the other expressive arts.

It is no accident that physical education has historically and now cultivated a lively correlation with music and art, drama and literature. No singular offshoot is our solid development of dance in all its forms as a means of human expression. These relationships are to be expected. Anything else would be foreign to the way people have always lived. The ceremony and festival, the pageant and party have always and do now call for a natural and inevitable

relationship of movement to all the others. We can well forget entirely, if we ever entertained the idea, that a physical education involves only games and athletics, and that all else is completely incomprehensible.

NINTH: That physical education stands upon its own feet as a profession, solidly within the scientific and social culture of the race, beholden to no other group, but ready to work cooperatively with other professions for human betterment.

The old inferiority complex we used to have is fading away. We are more sure now of our contribution. Soon it will be that those educators who do not see the values inherent in a physical education will themselves have lost their intellectual integrity. The process of human development cannot remain forever obscured by the dust of academic tradition. Our profession is soundly established. We have within our own ranks people of great intellectual strength and from other professions we have been assisted by great and significant revelations concerning the social and organic importance of the kind of education with which we deal. Once we lived in the backyard of education under the shadow of medicine. We do so no longer. Our contribution to human development is sufficiently in the open now to allow us to say with a modest assurance that we can and do make, not supplementary additions to growth and development, but unique and original ones.

TENTH: That the high quality of leadership is the primary desideratum of this as of other professions, and that the American university must keep its standards high and its efforts unremitting for the selection and preparation of intelligent, well equipped, and cultured women and men teachers of physical education.

We need leaders. All of education needs leaders. Where education has failed to meet national crises it has failed in leadership. Where physical education sometimes goes awry and runs madly down some dead-end streets it does so because its leadership takes it there. Teachers everywhere must be taught to think, to discriminate, to evaluate, to teach. Certainly in physical education we have had enough of those who remain in the rut of tradition.

Nor need American universities apologize for their existing curriculums in physical and health education. They are strangely constructed in some places, that is true, and the academic eyebrow raises sometimes when we abuse the privilege of giving academic credit by awarding it to mastery which involved no intellectualizing. But by and large our curriculums are stable and reputable. We know in general how to build them, and as the years go on the physical education teacher graduating from one of our universities will measure up perfectly with the professional bachelor in other fields.

Thus the decalogue of principles is completed. It is the fulfillment of the first cycle of growth, the heritage which our predecessors have left us. These are the directions physical education is now taking.

Wherein Lies Significance?

Wherein lies significance? We have been searching for it for many years. Memory has its disadvantages. I find it extremely rewarding to have been a participant in the development of physical education during this last half century—during the years from 1920 to 1970—a half century of search for significance!

We are in 1971 now, but our mission is not yet accomplished. We have not yet found all the significance that I am sure rests within the field. As I look back on those 50 years in physical education, I can report that it has been a struggle—a fascinating struggle—to explore, to uncover, to look and to see, and to find out what there is within this field that entrances us all.

I can think in my 50 years of Amy Morris Homans of Wellesley, of J. Anna Norris of Minnesota and Gertrude Moulton of Oberlin, of Ethel Perrin of Detroit (one of the most remarkable women we ever had in our field—little bit of a thing who ran the whole city of Detroit's program by herself), of Laurentine Collins and Mabel Lee. Remember Gertrude Colby and Mary O'Donnell of Columbia? Katharine Hersey and Lydia Clark of Ohio State? Blanche Trilling and Mary Channing Coleman? Great names. Helen McKinstry of the YWCA, Margaret McKee of Missouri, Alfrieda Moss crop, Ethel Saxman,

Delivered to the Association of Physical Education for College Women at the annual meeting of the Southern District of AAHPER at Oklahoma City, February 25, 1971.

Marge D'Houbler, among many others, some still around, some passed on to their reward. But it was a rare privilege to struggle with those valiant souls to find significance, to create upon the unstable foundation which was ours—the unstable foundation of essentially German and Swedish and Danish and English heritage—to find an American program suited to our people, our society, and our purposes.

As I think of those names I have a feeling always of the great and courageous efforts they were making, as our predecessors, to create, evolve, and develop a program to fit the needs of our people, particularly the youth in our society. We were not always successful. That is to say, we are not capable yet of saying that this is our program for our people. It is difficult in a pluralistic society. So all I intend to do is suggest three or four sources of significance.

First, it is of consummate significance that we persist in our efforts to develop programs that reflect the social, the political, and the educational goals of our people and that have no value in variance from those goals. How difficult it is to create a program in the image of our democratic society—partly because we have had a hard time defining our democratic society, partly because by its very nature it is an elusive quality (much more so than some of the other political systems the world has known in the last century), partly because you and I, if we were to make an honest confession, would probably say we have not at all times done our homework. We have not read Jefferson, Madison, Henry Adams and Lincoln and John Dewey, Jane Addams and Horace Mann, Woodrow Wilson and Jack Kennedy, and probably not even Leiberman or Norman Cousins, great persons who have woven part of the backdrop of American education. They have struggled to help us create programs of American education that reflect the best of this great idea which broke upon our shores 300 years ago.

I suggest that those people I have mentioned are so important in physical education that you and I cannot possibly find significance until we have read them. It is easier not to read. Our field is such a happy field that it is easier not to do our homework. It is much easier to go over to England, find something that is working over there, and bring it over here. It is much easier to do some research on American Indian dances and put them in the junior high school, to introduce yoga or karate or judo, to resurrect the formalism of the Swedish gymnastics programs or to bring over Danish. It is much easier to find some gimmick, some novelty, something esoteric, something slightly offbeat out of which we can make a cult than to do our homework and try to figure out what it is that the world of education can contribute to the preservation of the particular society, to figure out what our goals are as a people of 200 million Americans, and *then* build a program to match it.

Is there a structured character to the society in which we live? Sure there is. Our legal structure is one. Based upon Blackstone, it carries the tradition of our legal system, our courts; our whole process of legalism is based upon clear principles. Our world derives from those principles and includes authority figures from the family to the teacher to the police. In our own field, we have our rules and our officials, our umpires, our referees. It is sad, therefore, when you see us failing to encourage adherence to authority, to the basic structure upon which our legalistic system is based. We are significant, after all. Children learn about authority on our basketball floors and our hockey fields. They should come to respect the word of the official as the authority figure. The official is the governor, the judge, the magistrate that ramifies through our society.

Thus, when one reads of the activity of some of our organizations that seem to be ignoring this basic element of structure in our society, one is saddened. When one reads, for example, of the activities of the NCAA and their system of penalties for violators of the law, one wonders! Many colleges, particularly through their men's athletic programs, get themselves in trouble because of violations of certain rules, and those colleges, of which mine was one several years ago, are penalized. They have to remain out; their teams may not share in television royalties or participate in a bowl game or a championship contest sponsored by the NCAA, because they are in violation of a certain rule. The penalties are inflicted upon the institution, not upon the offender. Our whole legal structure is based upon the idea that the offender is the one who is brought to court and penalized if found guilty. But if Oklahoma or Ohio State is penalized by the NCAA, the whole system is set down for a year or so—every team and every player. When we were set down about seven years ago because of certain infractions of NCAA regulations on the part of our coaches of *one* sport, *all* players in *all* sports were affected, and thus our world-champion diver could not go to the championships, and the tennis team could not go to their tournament, and the basketball team could not go to theirs because of the offense committed by someone else! It is as if you offended and I was penalized, which is in complete violation of the basic structure of our legal system.

It is difficult when one sees the shady cheating, the violent disruption of college games, the showboating of coaches as they encourage players to violate the laws. The difference between throwing a seat cushion and a rock is not very great. If we are willing to condone throwing seat cushions, it is just a small step to throwing rocks. If those of us who have lived through tumultuous times cannot teach our children in the physical education classes to protect our legally established cultural patterns, we have missed an opportunity to find the potential significance of our field. If we cannot teach our children to accept the consequences of their acts, if we cannot teach our players to accept the role of

officials, we are not finding a significant relationship between us and the goals our society seeks. This is one of the reasons I have always thought that behavior is just as important, if not more so, than skill.

It is significant that students understand purpose in all of their educational experience. Today there is a rather healthy revival of John Dewey, and having been a student of John Dewey many years ago on Morningside Heights, I remember his constant pleas to the educators of his time to understand, to explain, to illuminate purpose. Why, said he constantly to us, what is the purpose of this? What is the purpose of the Cotton Bowl, the Rose Bowl, a hockey game, a swimming meet, a volleyball contest? What is the purpose of algebra and of English history and of geometry? He has always, in his writings belabored the impotence, the futility of teaching in the classical tradition of Latin and algebra and requiring them for all without a single explanation of why.

The most significant and important question that can be asked in all of education is "why"? That is why I so much enjoyed an experience I had some years ago on the advisory committee of a Job Corps installation in New Bedford, Mass., run by Bill Saltonstall, the cousin of the famous senator, Everett Saltonstall. Saltonstall had come out of Exeter after 20 years of dealing with "the upper classes." In the Job Corps, he ran a beautiful school for 480 dropouts—men and boys, 16 to 18 years old, that our system of education had missed completely. They had dropped out because, as one of them said to me, "I didn't care particularly about the names of the English queens. I wasn't too terribly excited about algebra." "How did you feel about physical education?" said I. He said, "I hated the stuff." He didn't know I was a physical education teacher, so I pursued the matter. "Why didn't you like it?" He said, "I have never known a meaner man or a more sadistic creature than my gym teacher." He meant the authoritarian demon who ordered them, marched them, counter-marched them, punished these lads in physical education. I said, "What do you want to get from the Job Corps?" He wanted to become a data processor. "What do you want to do if you can't become a data processor?" And he said, "I want to become a physical education teacher." Amazing switch. I said, "Why?" He said, "Because I realize that in that field there were potentials, there was an opportunity to deal with the kind of a guy I am—a dropout." He was black and he was a victim and a refugee of the great riots in Buffalo. But he said, "I can see, I did see, and I hope to have chance to bring to life the meaning and the purpose of what physical education can establish." Needless to say, we had quite a conversation about that!

Purpose is important. What is the purpose of karate, ballet, judo, boxing, yoga, basketball? We must find purpose in things we do, and our purposes must reflect accurately the basic social and political purposes of our American society.

The second source of significance is one with which I have bored you many times before, but I must mention it because we have suffered long enough from the popular misconception that physical education is strictly a physical thing, that we do not deal with people but with protoplasm. Therefore, we seek to achieve nothing but strength and other physical values. Hence, we bring back mass exercise and physical training, and we do not know the difference between physical training and physical education. In my estimation, this is blinding. It has been my observation that not more than 20 percent of our people around the country seek any other values than those emphasized by the adjective "physical." Maybe a little leisure creeps in now and then, or someone talks about movement, but for the most part, we still think of ourselves pridefully as purveyors of physical fitness. We have to remake this concept before we find our significant potential.

We have to recognize that physical education experience is distinctly a personal thing not measured by protoplasmic quantity, not measured by hearthbeat or the EKG or the Krebs's cycle or the fitness scores. *These are nothing more than means* by which we can get some purchase on the total evaluation of the experience that a girl or boy has with us in our program. We have an obligation to the student. Our principal task is to deal with her as a total human being. We need to help her look inside herself to examine her own thoughts and feelings, to help her to confront and not evade her own anxiety and loneliness, to treasure the idea, the hope, the development—not just the care and feeding of an individual. The experience in physical education can produce acceptance rather than rejection, success rather than frustration, self-actualization rather than disintegration, fun and pleasure rather than debilitating tensions, recognitions of reality over fantasy, the development of self-respect rather than self-negation. *These* are the big ends for physical education, the big words—success, acceptance, self-actualization, self-direction, self-respect.

Why the student unrest of the 1960s and spirited 70s? There have been many versions around the country. I think, and I agree with Norman Cousins and other writers, that certainly this generation of students wants to play a part in determining their own education. Why must I take algebra? Why is physical education required? Why? Unless we come up with the answers, we're gone, we're sunk. The answers in our field are perfectly clear: rich, exciting experience for most people. I agree fully with René DuBos, who emphasizes that life in America can become enriched only to the extent that we measure its quality and not its quantity. We do not care about our fleet or our Gross National Product or the number of federal employees we have or any other statistic, but the concern has to be centered upon the quality of the lives of the people, all 200 million of us. Thus, the only reason in terms of this element of significance for our existence is the contribution we can make to the emerging personality of the developing girl and not to the Krebs's cycle and not to the fitness test.

Wherein lies significance? May I suggest a third source? I think the significance of our field can be found as long as we keep in mind that physical education is a whole thing. We must never allow ourselves to segment it, divide it into its parts and thus allow the parts to obscure, to dominate, to usurp, and to blind us to the wholeness of the experience and the profession. I am frightened with what has happened to medicine with the development of the specialist—the otorhinolaryngologist, the psychiatrist, the neuropsychiatrist, the internist—a whole field of 14 or 18 or 22 specialists. If we do this sort of thing in physical education—develop specialists in gymnastics, dance, motor learning, and exercise physiology and forget that the field is a whole field employing a wide variety of different activities to produce the kind of results in the development of human personality that we're after—then I do not think we will ever be able to find significance.

I am very much concerned about dance today. Dance seems to be moving away from its origins in physical education to the performing arts. What is a performing art? Is football a performing art? Is basketball? Golf? Tennis? Why does dance have the character of the performing arts? Dancers are performers, and is what they do an art? I dare say it is both, but is it not physical education? Is it not part of the education of the individual? Does it not contribute to the total person? Are teachers of dance today more interested in the movement than the movers? I know what dance is, but I hate to see the field going Broadway. I saw Villella the other night and Nureyev a month or two ago; they are magnificent dancers. But what kind of people have they become *because* they are dancers? That is the crucial question. To fragment the field to the point where we fail to have a common purpose or to understand each other would be the greatest mistake we could make.

In closing, let me suggest that we will find significance when we realize that our "discipline"—if there is such a thing—will be found not in such artificial subject matter demarcations as physiology or movement or skills or chemistry or even philosophy, but in the revelation of our contribution to the science of human experience. Therein lies significance. We must pursue this exploration to find those elements indigenous to our movement experience that make the contribution to the human being developing in our evolving but nevertheless broadly structured society.

To find this, I believe, was what our forebears tried to get us to do. I am hoping that the search of those women I mentioned at the beginning will not be abandoned or forgotten as we grow in number and size and importance and dignity. Significance lies in our contribution to the totality of human experience as we seek to live in a society directed toward clear goals of which the enrichment of human personality is the essential element.

An Armenian from Des Moines

My principal credential for occupying this spot of privilege is that I knew the man, Holger F. Kilander, whose memory we celebrate today. We were friends of long and pleasant standing. We shared accommodations at at least two professional meetings, and when it came time to recognize him with the presentation of the Howe Award from the American School Health Association, the committee asked me to prepare and read a citation. In it I said, "A prominent contemporary churchman described a liberally educated person as one who has a clear, conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, seeks the truth in developing them, is eloquent in expressing these judgments, and is forceful in arguing them." Holger F. Kilander qualifies fully. Kellie was motivated by an indomitable will to serve. Rarely has our profession contained a man who exemplifies with such absolute clarity the happy combination of altruism, sharp intellect, and an infinite capacity to be useful. Here was truly a professional cosmopolite. His record was fantastically broad. He was a writer of distinction. He was a stimulating professor in health education. His research effort is renowned. He was a sportsman, world traveler, raconteur, and administrator.

My fervent hope, at this moment, is that these remarks of mine will do justice to Dr. Kilander, whom you have chosen to honor by dedicating this meeting.

The Holger F. Kilander Memorial Lecture delivered at the annual meeting of the Eastern District of AAHPER, New York, March 16, 1974.

The title of this presentation would suggest that I knew a gentleman from Des Moines. Indeed, I did. I remember him well. I had an unplanned luncheon with him at the hotel just before a 2 o'clock meeting with the Iowa Physical Education Association. The hotel was crowded with teachers, and teachers were not in very good repute at that time because of the attacks made upon us by such dubious authorities as Admiral Rickover, John Hersey, Clifton Fadiman, and others. They were contending that American education was of a low order and that something drastic should be done about it. My companion at the table, after he had ascertained that I was a teacher, made a rather startling remark: "You teachers are the most important people in the world." Gratified by this, I suggested that he explain why he thought so. He replied that it was his belief that it was on the shoulders of teachers that the preservation of this democratic society rested. He insisted that to maintain our freedom as free persons in a free society, the principal task of teachers was to convey to the oncoming generation the full meaning of these concepts. He had seen *his* country destroyed by the invaders. Their freedoms were lost, families destroyed; the whole fabric of their society had been disintegrated by the oppressor. He wanted desperately to prevent that from happening here, and he placed us teachers in the front line of defense against it. He was an Armenian, and Armenia had been destroyed by the Turks in 1915-16.

I have thought a great deal about what he had in mind, particularly what it meant to us in physical education, health education, and recreation. Is there something within the scope of these three fields that will accomplish his purpose? Does the field of recreation, as we know it, have a bearing upon preserving our free society? May the same thing be said about health education or physical education? What *did* he mean? My table companion indirectly challenged us to examine our contribution to free persons living in a free society.

Where do we begin? We are three fields. Are we separate in our character and influence, or are we related? I believe that we are quite obviously related in that we spring from a common element of concern with and influence upon the qualitative aspects of human experience as it relates to the *whole* person. Probably the only reason we exist is to be judged by the contribution we make to the emerging personality of the human being—to the integrated self, reaching beyond the commonly recognized boundaries of the mental, physical, and emotional levels of consciousness not yet easily recognized in Western civilization. This sort of thing is described, perhaps, as a transpersonal self involving wholeness not readily acknowledged by those not prepared to think beyond the familiar dichotomy of mind and body. Whatever our eventual concept of wholeness may become, my contention is that the three fields will find their similarities in their essential contributions to it.

We will, and do, make that contribution through a process—the process of

education—by which humans come into increasing possession of themselves and their powers through increasing and continuously expanding participation in the achievement of the race, while they evaluate and re-evaluate this achievement as they gain control of the methods of using it.

Once we grasp the nature and purpose of this process as it fosters the development of humans in their holistic state, I believe we can make a strong claim to a potential and important contribution to the perpetuation of a free society for free persons. But such contribution will not come automatically just because we say it is there. We have to work at it. We have to educate people to want to preserve their freedom, then to construct and reconstruct their society so that it is preserved. The key is *education* and its bearing upon the *whole* person.

For example, I have often wondered why so many of our people, particularly in physical education, shy away from such effort and are content to tell the world that we are so terribly "physical." It is not too difficult to become physical. The Turks who destroyed Armenia were very physical in their invasion, as were the Nazis when they took the Low Countries, as were the Nigerians in their destruction of the Biafrans, as were the sheriffs and their dogs at Selma and the police in Chicago. Strength is strength wherever you find it, and if its production is the only mission in life of a physical educator to the exclusion of the *purposes* to which strength is put, then we have a very easy task indeed.

But my Armenian companion was talking about something else. He was talking about the preservation of freedom, about teaching people how to live together as free persons in this free society. To us in physical education the implication is clear: *What* is our purpose, the overriding purpose of our existence? Is it strength? I doubt it.

In preparation for our meeting this afternoon, I have been brushing up on some current writing in physical education. I was hunting for some evidence that physical educators are currently exploring their contribution to the society that sustains them. I chose to examine the last three issues of *Quest*, thus sampling the writing of that group of intellectuals who write for the college associations. I did not find much because, as one writer put it, most institutions offering the doctorate in physical education encourage their candidates to specialize in such subdisciplines as exercise physiology, sport psychology, motor learning, or sports sociology. That latter subspecialty might have some promise, but I could not find much beyond Ellis and Hubbard on human and mechanical factors in ergometry, a paper on the deception paradigm and debriefing, and Renshaw on the nature of human movement studies. I found a paper on the taxonomy of research, Studer on moving man to moving man—but with no hint that it might be important to study the purpose of movement. In the

most recent issue, of those I perused, Podeschi wrote a promising piece on the further reaches of physical activity, and Roberta Park entices us to believe that there are alternatives of nonactivity that might be used in the future. There were stories on chronobiology, holography, trend extrapolation. So it was pleasant to read Ann Jewett prognosticating the future, telling us that physical education will focus on each person, will be seen as a continuing educational process with voluntary participation, and stronger and more creative leadership will predominate—just as Williams and Nash and Wood and Perrin and Hetherington used to tell us 50 years ago.

We will have to put up with many diversions and excursions into research esoterica before we strike pay dirt in the form of an implementation of our programs as an effective tool for the perpetuation of the free democratic way—whatever the future holds that to be.

Overall, the review of recent literature was reasonably reassuring. If it is safe to make any judgment on the basis of the contents of that one bi-annual publication, *Quest*, we are gaining. We are getting there. Monographs put out by those college associations contain more material germane to the challenge I have been describing.

But I found one scholar in the field saying that he “rarely ever uses the term *physical education* anymore”—he substitutes *sports medicine*. I can only conclude that he does not know the meaning of the word *education* and equates *medicine* with it. I understand those in dance find it more comfortable to think in terms of the “performing arts” than to evaluate the rewards in personal development that come from the educational experience of being creative in the world of dance. Dance as a performing art can be equated rather easily with skill on the high wire, the balance beam, the high hurdles, or the “front four.” The human element of total growth—intellectual, social, moral, *total* growth—is ignored for performance only of the athlete, the dancer, or the elephant on his box. That is all that counts if we conceive of our activities solely in terms of performing arts.

I read about the mysteries of motor learning, of kinesthetics, of operant conditioning, exercise physiology, and performance-based teacher education. In fact, unless I am mistaken, there are some college departments so anxious to become accepted by the averred “intellectuals” of the campus that they have declared their emancipation from the lowbrow term of *physical education* and have become something else sounding strangely like good old *kinesiology*—the study of the origin, insertion, and action of muscles!

What nonsense! What shallow and irresponsible thinking to discard the term *education* for such mechanistic or biological terms related only to muscle action and how to direct it!

What *are* the goals of physical education in this day and age? Strength? Physical fitness? Skill? We won't quarrel with those as long as no one says they are the principal or ultimate goal. They are not. Anyone can be strong and brainless. Anyone can be physically fit and have the conscience of a murderer. Anyone can win the Heisman Trophy and have the social skills of a slob. Strength, skill, and fitness are not enough to have in this republic based upon a free society of free persons.

It becomes of consummate importance that we build programs of physical education that reflect the social, political, and cultural character of our society and have no goals at variance from that character. It is important to realize that physical education is a complex discipline involving such potential outcomes as self-expression, skill, systemic integrity, fun and enjoyment, acceptable behavior, understanding of self, and understanding of human interaction. From the inescapable human interaction can come an understanding of the democratic way, including as its principal ingredient respect for personality and an understanding of ethics. Of course, to obtain all of these as outcomes is a prodigious task and is so frightening to most people in physical education they back away from it and choose simpler outcomes to explore and to obtain.

But of even greater importance than the individual and potential social controls provided by the physical education potential is experience in thinking, involving as that does examination of new and promising ways to solve problems, application and evaluation of some of them, selection of successful techniques, and resumption of the ongoing activity.

The Armenian meant that free persons in a free society learn to make decisions and to accept the consequences of their decisions. Many of us have been drumming upon this for years, and only recently have we felt the impact of the American student who wants to participate in the decision-making process that affects one's education and one's destiny.

How can we intensify this in physical education? By inviting students to participate in elementary, high school, and college curriculum making; by giving them a participatory experience in determining the strategy of games, selection of their leaders, standards of dress, rule making, and choreography. I am totally unable to understand today's trend in modern dance, for example, which seems to emphasize performance rather than creative expression in choreography. Dance is getting to be just like college football; the coach does 90 percent of the thinking. If the trend continues to the point where college dance groups emulate Broadway as big-time college football cares only about bowl games and being "number one," then I can understand clearly how and why dance has lost its birthright as a physical *education* activity. This sort of thinking requires an opportunity to evaluate current practice by testing, altering

the practice if it does not fit the recognized need, and then constructing new ways of doing things in terms of what has been learned.

This process of evaluating, of thinking through a problem, causes us to examine our concept of the origin of authority. Wherein lies authority in a democracy, and how do you teach people how to acknowledge and observe it? In the first place, the Greeks understood that democracy meant simply "the rule of people." We have borrowed the idea, and from Thomas Jefferson on down to Lincoln, Wilson, Stevenson, William O. Douglas, and a host of others who have written about this democratic way, we have been told that we, the people, are in command. We, the people, establish the rules by which we live. We, the people, select our leaders, our councils, Congress, and our Presidents, and we expect from them leadership in the image of our fundamental precepts in return for which we acknowledge their authority in administering our complex society.

The referee, the teacher, or the coach in our world of physical education becomes the authority figure and is deserving of our respect because he or she has been chosen by us to be our representative in conducting our interesting activities. How can anyone, then, in physical education lie, cheat, use shady practices, take the rules of the game unto himself for his own purposes to the disadvantage of his opponents? Such practice is destructive of the society in which we live. How could anyone riot, or encourage a riot, at one of our athletic contests? How could anyone cry the disrespectful "boo" without knowing that he thereby undermines the very authority we chose and agreed to live by?

And thus my lament about physical education, most sadly sung at times, seems to center on our use or misuse of the word *education*. The word must have a meaning. It surely can be better defined than merely to say that any old experience is education. I suppose any old experience *is* education. Falling in front of a subway is an experience, and it is educating. Robbing a bank is an experience, and *it* is educating, but common sense tells us that sort of thing is not what we are talking about as we try to describe the educational potential in the physical education experience. There has to be some element of quality involved, and that element has to have some relation to the social destiny of the democratic culture within which we live and to the adaptation of the individual not only to one's own growth and development potential, but to one's relation to the acceptable and evolving social patterns of society.

We have just described education as the process by which one comes into possession of oneself and one's powers. Where better than in the dynamic laboratory of the gymnasium or the playing field, the pool, the ski run, or the dance studio can one learn of one's possibilities and limitations? Where better, indeed, to find some answers to youth's question, "who am I?"

Particularly potent is such an analysis of the relation to education of the physical education experience if we recognize that it is not sufficient that we teach the telemark or the cross-body hock as motor skills or teach our young people to say "Nice game" at the end of a contest. We must go beyond that into the meaning of whatever behavior or skill is involved in terms of personal growth, and the meaning of the interplay of personality upon personality as we seek those laudable objectives of harmony, peace, and friendship among all peoples of this world. Is there anything more anachronistic, inconsistent, and downright stupid than to see an international ice hockey match purporting to adhere to the Olympic ideal of understanding between nations, in which one side seems bent upon beating out the brains of the other side by any means, fair or foul? The noun *education* in our term physical education still has meaning. It is about time we sought it out and tried to make something of it.

Is the concept of equality of opportunity important in all this? One of the first concepts and administrative practices that we need to grasp fully, if we are to have a bearing upon the perpetuation of our free and democratic society, is that we, as teachers of physical education and directors of recreation, need to develop a firm, uncompromising, and unshakable belief in the equality of opportunity for *all* people. Let us not be elementary about this. We know, of course, that not all persons are created equal, but when Horace Mann opened the American school system to all, he meant that opportunity for learning must be spread equally to *all* children so that educational programs would mirror the social status of democracy. We are only about half done with our task. There are still far too many girls and women, far too many boys and men, and far too many of the handicapped who as yet do not enjoy the fruits of the physical education experience or have access to recreational facilities.

We are talking about the 40 percent of all boys and girls who entered the first grade this year but who will drop out for one or another reason before leaving high school. The chances are their physical education experience did not mean much to them while they were there. We are talking about the 400,000 children who will be before our courts this year as delinquent, and about the tens of thousands of alienated adolescents. What are we doing on a broad scale to open the physical education experience to these people? We are talking about the 500,000 children with psychomotor handicaps and the 10 million hungry and undernourished children who will be permanently affected by the defects in our society which deny them enough opportunity for growth. We are talking about the 7 million children whose life expectancy is shortened by disease, hunger, and despair, and about the 4 percent of all babies who come into this world with birth defects and whose lives are blighted unless we, or others, can help them compensate for their handicaps. And, of course, we are thinking about the millions of others with cardiovascular and neurological deficits, pulmonary dysfunctions, orthopedic problems, or metabolic disturbances who are too

frequently excused for some reason or other from experience with either physical education or health education.

Of course, we remain respectful of the talented, and we go to great lengths to provide the highly skilled with opportunity to cultivate their talent, but in virtually every school system in the land there are thousands of children who have not yet been brought within the physical education complex in a satisfying manner, if at all. There are equal numbers whose communities have not yet outlined the need for recreational programs for all. We have not yet directed our attention fully to the meaning of equality of opportunity, and thus we have not seen the emergence of the forgotten and rejected, the disparaged, impoverished, and the desperate who wish to emerge from the long dust that hides them from our view and become refreshed in the bright light of history. Theoretically, we have no closed society. We must do our part to open to the whole scope of humanity, to make sure we extend our program to all in terms of their capacity to receive it.

I am thinking, as I say these words, of that magnificent expenditure of \$170 million now going on in New Orleans to provide a place for athletes in one sport or another to perform before appreciating masses, while in Roxbury, two years ago, we had to close a couple of playgrounds in some of the less favored areas of the city for want of about \$5,000 to keep them going! But I always have been, and am now, of the firm belief that the physical education experience, based as it is on human movement, can be, if thoughtfully and purposefully administered, the most important force in all of education for child development and personal growth. It is up to us to make the most of it and not be diverted by objectives not related to the development of the whole child.

Now, let us look at health education. It has been said that to be free—free, that is, from the shackles of ignorance and fear, free to roam the unexplored, free to use discovery and innovation—humans must possess knowledge in abundance. The revelations of science and philosophy, religion and communication must be theirs in order not only to understand themselves, but to so order their world that they can survive the pressures of its population.

In health education we are intimately concerned with that point of view. We fit right into the scheme of things. Our principal contribution to the requirements of a free society is that of providing knowledge—not knowledge, as we have said over and over again, just to have knowledge, but functioning, productive, and useful knowledge that can be used in helping us to maintain our lives and foster our adjustment to a hostile and developing world. We will let others be concerned with the transmission of the culture of the ablative absolute and the War of Roses, while we become concerned about the knowledge our children may possess that will point them in line congenially with the social and

ethnic problems the War of Roses generated. Can anything be more fundamental than that?

Knowledge is significant, important, and basic to survival when it is the sort of knowledge not gained by accident or by cursory attempts to teach the structure of the human animal, but knowledge that will permit a girl or a boy to know the difference between science and quackery, between fraud and exaggeration in advertising and the realizable ends in the relief of human suffering. We need to provide a basic and comforting knowledge that will enable our students to read *McCall's* or *Mademoiselle* or *Sports Illustrated* or listen to a commercial for aspirin or toothpaste and not be taken in by the extraordinary promise held out by the hucksters. Such talent requires not a superficial knowledge. It is something that cannot be transmitted once a week or on rainy days by apathetic teachers. It requires the kind of time, depth, and application now allotted to mathematics—new or old!

One cannot be free to develop one's own talent, create one's own satisfactions, preserve and cultivate one's own family life, ward off the catastrophic influences of war and pestilence and hunger, until one *knows* what to do and why and how. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse can be dispelled only through a workable, pointed, and militant knowledge.

Consider the temptations of the day and the more esoteric movements now crowding in on us through religious, commercial, and other forms of social institutions. How does one handle the implications of yoga or sensitivity training? What of value is present in transactional analysis or psychosynthesis? Has acupuncture been lying dormant for a thousand years only now to be useful in Western civilization? What about our old friends chiropractic and osteopathy or any of the modern forms of manipulative medicine? Do our students have a pretty good grasp of the nature of psychosomatic relationships insofar as they are now known?

To prepare a child to be ready to deal with the onslaught of such esoterica will require more than we are now offering—more time, more literature, more and better teachers—and we cannot go it alone. We have to have help from *all* the sciences—from biology and physiology and chemistry and the social studies. If some of our foundations interested in improving the quality of human lives wanted to do something tremendously productive in the next 10 years, they could do nothing better than to call us all together for a conference—all these now self-contained areas of study and all their basic offshoots and satellites—that would identify our principal health problems and proceed to synthesize the contribution of each area as they aid in the solution of these problems.

Why not? We have had conferences on childhood, on adolescence, and on